

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 7, 1990

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We offer our appreciation, O God, that the dark of night is ending for so many people in so many places. Continue, we pray, to show us the freedoms that honor Your creation and may our response to that freedom be that of a great thanksgiving for the gifts of this new life and hope. With praise and gratitude we offer this our prayer. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. HOUGHTON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

The Chair announces that during the joint meeting to receive the Honorable Giulio Andreotti, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, February 27, 1990, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1057

## JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY GIULIO ANDREOTTI, PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, the Honorable James T. Molloy, announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort his Excellency, Giulio Andreotti, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT];

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY];

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL];

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR];

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER];

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO];

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSSO];

The gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA];

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO];

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI];

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL];

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH];

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD];

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS];

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE];

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO];

The gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO];

The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMAL];

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO]; and

The gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President pro tempore of the Senate,

at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic, Giulio Andreotti, into the Chamber:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL];

The Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL];

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFFEE];

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR]; and

The Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO].

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and charge d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

At 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic, escorted by committee of Senators and Representatives entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and personal pleasure to present to you the honorable, Giulio Andreotti, President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

## ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY GIULIO ANDREOTTI, PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

(The following address was delivered in Italian, with a simultaneous translation in English.)

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

President ANDREOTTI. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, the honor of speaking before the representatives of this Nation gives me and the country I represent great satisfaction and pride.

My mind turns, first, to the distant September 1951, when Alcide De Gasperi, Premier and Foreign Minister of Italy, a country then on the way toward moral and material reconstruction after the tragedy of the war, received in this very Chamber a warm welcome.

What I feel before this Congress is respect for the history of the great Nation you represent and for how generations of Americans have held fast, even in the most difficult of moments, to the principles of democracy and freedom enshrined in the Declaration of Independence of 1776. They were the same principles which were soon to find a solemn expression in Europe.

There are, between the old and new continents, streams of affinity, of active solidarity, of shared interests, not only material ones.

But there is something more to this natural partnership: the United States, by signing the Helsinki accords, has accepted to contribute permanently to the security and the development of cooperation in Europe, becoming together with Canada, because of the CSCE process, an integral part of the European Continent.

We have traveled together a long road in the framework of NATO, which was created as a defensive alliance, but it was above all an association of free nations.

Yesterday as today, freedom, justice and the vitality of our societies are our most precious heritage, to be defended against poverty and unemployment, but also from the deterioration of the environment and drug abuse.

Thomas Jefferson said he preferred the dreams of the future to the history of the past. What I am feeling toward you at this very moment is trust: trust that the American people of whom you are the worthy representatives will be able to interpret the needs and requirements of mankind at the moment when it is looking hopefully toward the third millennium.

Today the wind of freedom and democracy is blowing strongly in the East. How could this happen? Because we have proven that democratic nations could remain united, could achieve increasing economic and social development without sacrificing democracy, could demonstrate concrete solidarity toward developing countries, could adopt a foreign policy as balanced and fair as it is steadfast to the values which inspired it.

If we now consider what is taking place in the East and the integration of Europe, it is important that we not look back at the past, but forward in order to gauge how far behind we may

be with respect to today's needs, as well as to those of a challenging future, when proper and timely choices will be necessary.

We want to continue building a Europe that is open to the world, not a fortress Europe as some mistakenly fear, but a Europe that is available, ever ready to cooperate in a spirit of true partnership with the United States, whose military presence in Europe must remain and must continue to work for all, as in the past, as a guarantee of stability and balance. Moreover, we want this new Europe that is being built to develop new and increasingly close and effective forms of linkage with this essential partner nation, the United States of America.

We cannot ignore the importance of an integration process intended to ensure strong and fundamental political stability for Europe. In this framework the reunification of Germany finds decisive support in the solidarity of its community partners, just as it has an essential anchorage in NATO and a secure guarantee in the larger assembly of the 35 Helsinki Conference nations.

The real issue today is how can we encourage change in the East without provoking repercussions that would stop its impetus. It seems to me that a concerted action of Western countries is more necessary than ever before.

The attempt to include the Soviet Union in a design of international stability has failed twice in the past, at least in part: The first time when Roosevelt proposed the creation of a new international order around the United Nations, and more recently when President Nixon attempted to stimulate the Soviet Union's interest in world stability through a generous trade program and through controlling the arms race.

Today, for the third time in 45 years, we face the same problem, with the difference, however, that a reformist plan is underway in the Soviet Union which we have an obligation as well as an interest in encouraging.

A new deal with the East should first of all include a drastic reduction of arms, especially conventional weapons which threaten us Europeans in terms of proximity and continuity.

However, nothing could better safeguard Western interests than the success of democracy in the East. We understand your sensitivity on this point since America is itself a creation of human rights rather than vice versa. It was Aldo Moro who at Helsinki led the battle on behalf of Italy and the European Community to remove the visible and invisible barriers blocking dialog among people in Europe. It was no easy battle, nor was it won once and for all, as is always the case in struggles for freedom. Upon signing the Final Act Moro stated: "The Final Act is not a notary's document which

only focuses on the present situation. In taking note of the existing territorial aspects and the fundamental prospects of cooperation it wants above all to be a bridge to the future."

Today we continue to work on building that bridge, without fearing the new, without shirking a political challenge which can sometimes appear more difficult than a military threat.

In effect, the example was set by the United States, that is by a democracy supported by principles coming from below, and which was born together with the popular myth of the frontier, opening itself to and welcoming other peoples.

My thoughts go out to my many fellow countrymen who ever since the end of the last century have been generously welcomed by this country. They have contributed with their industriousness, talents, and human qualities to the growth of this Nation.

We have proudly seen so many Americans of Italian origin become Members of this Congress. Many of them are still here with us. Others no longer sit in this Chamber. Permit me to mention, out of all of these, John Pastore and Peter Rodino, with whom I have had ties of great friendship.

Now I wish to refer to the new frontiers of a better quality of life, of overcoming the divisions between North and South, of the protection of the environment, of a fairer distribution of resources and of new conquests of science for the benefit of mankind. I also refer to the new frontiers where coexistence will restore freedom from basic needs to all men and will grant them the dignity of being true masters of their own fate.

These goals require tools capable of mobilizing all existing resources.

This is why the United Nations must remain a privileged forum of expression. It is necessary and the time is ripe to reestablish within the United Nations an authentic spirit of solidarity like the one which animated the promoters of the San Francisco Charter, when the ashes of the war had not yet cooled down.

It will certainly be necessary to produce new rules, new codes of behavior, and new understandings to tackle the existing emergencies and prevent new ones from arising.

In this framework, it will probably be wise to review the decisionmaking mechanisms so that the United Nations' action can be more effective and timely when tackling the challenges of the third millennium. It will also be useful to strengthen the role of the International Court of Justice as a natural forum for finding a peaceful solution to disputes amongst countries.

But it is only through sharing intentions, through adhering to disciplines which are not imposed but voluntarily



accepted, through a new concept of co-existence with others that it will be possible to conceive and build a better and fairer world. It should be a world of justice, of that justice which, as Harry Truman stated in his inaugural speech at the San Francisco conference, "remains the greatest power on earth—the only extraordinary power to which we are willing to submit."

I want my words to be ones of hope and trust. At a historic juncture offering so many causes for prudent optimism I think it is essential to continue our work, as we have in the past, and to strengthen the commitments of mutual solidarity. I would like to conclude by recalling what Abraham Lincoln said when contemplating the enlargement of the Capitol dome: "If people see that work on the Capitol goes on, it is a sign we intend that the Union go on."

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m. the President of the Council of Ministers of the Italian Republic, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and chargé d'affaires of foreign governments.

#### JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until 12:15 p.m.

□ 1221

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.

#### PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Kalbaugh, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2151. An act to permit the transfer of the obsolete submarine U.S.S. *Requin* to the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh, PA, before the expiration of the 60-day waiting period that would otherwise be applicable to the transfer; and

S.J. Res. 257. Joint resolution to designate March 10, 1990, as "Harriet Tubman Day."

#### TRICKLED ON

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1980's the Donald Trumps of the world got richer, and the average American got trickled on. There is no other way to describe the tax policies of the Reagan-Bush administrations.

Capital gains tax cuts for the rich; tax increases for everyone else. Most of the Reagan-Bush tax cuts were showered on the wealthiest minority of taxpayers, while the vast majority of Americans, saw their taxes go up. Bush is lobbying to cut capital gains taxes again.

Second, in George Bush's new budget he proposes to raise \$28 billion in new taxes and fees—on everything from telephones to Medicare. Bush's motto is if it moves, tax it. If it doesn't move, charge a fee.

Third, in this morning's newspapers we read he plans on shoving more of the Federal share of road projects off on the States. Meanwhile, he continues to hoard the money in the highway trust fund in order to mask the size of the deficit.

Finally, payroll taxes on employees and employers continue to rise, while the Social Security trust fund is looted to pay Federal bills. The American taxpayers are being trickled on, and the man at the sprinkler is George Bush.

#### PRESIDENT BUSH TOO CAUTIOUS FOR LIBERAL DEMOCRATS

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic majority leader said yes-

terday, "The United States is failing to capitalize on the sweeping changes in Eastern Europe" because of what he called President Bush's timid, unimaginative leadership.

By liberal democratic standards, President Bush is too cautious. Liberal Democrats gave America the Bay of Pigs disaster in Cuba. President Bush is too cautious for that.

Liberal Democrats gave America the catastrophe of the Vietnam war. President Bush is too cautious for that.

Liberal Democrats gave America the Iranian hostage crisis and the Desert One tragedy. President Bush is too cautious for that.

This afternoon I have a 1-hour special order on the choice between liberal democratic foreign policy disasters and the common sense approach of President Bush, which in Nicaragua and Eastern Europe and around the world is helping people achieve freedom. I urge my Democratic colleagues to join me for a dialog on whose foreign policy has been more effective over the last generation.

#### UNITED STATES SHOULD DO MORE THAN JUST SLEEPWALK THROUGH GREAT CHANGES OF TODAY

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very amused by the previous comments attacking the very fine speech by the majority leader yesterday. The majority leader seems to have the quaint idea that the United States ought to do more than sleepwalk through some of the greatest changes that have occurred in the world in the past 45 years.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], for instance, has proposed that the United States ought to consider providing food assistance to the Soviet Union if they need it to get through a serious winter, if that will help continue Soviet reform and if the Soviet Union asks for it. What is wrong with that? That is consistent with the suggestions made by President Havel just 2 weeks ago when he addressed this Congress and said that the best way for the United States to help promote freedom in Eastern Europe was to help the Soviets continue their process of reform.

I would also like to point out the administration itself is now negotiating with our European allies to establish an East European bank upon which the Soviet Union itself could draw.

I think the comments of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] are perfectly consistent with the administration's position on that.

I would simply suggest that what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] was saying yesterday is that when we have a national earthquake and the Republican floor leader in the Senate suggested that we provide some aid to Armenia, we did it.

Today we have had a political earthquake which requires us to make the same kind of response in Eastern Europe.

I am glad that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is aware of the need to do that, even if the White House is not.

#### EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE IN AMERICA

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the President, when the Governors, when the State legislatures across this land and, yes, when the U.S. Senate are all committed and taking the necessary steps to take this Nation to educational excellence, I regret to inform the House that here the Democratic majority on the Education and Labor Committee this morning moved on a partisan line vote simply to postpone further consideration of the President's Education in Excellence Act. For 8 years people have criticized the last administration for not doing enough for education. Now we have a President who 1 year ago said to this Congress that this piece of legislation which lays out the basic steps for improving educational excellence and getting this Nation on the road to educational reform, such things as awards for merit schools, such things as alternative certification so we can bring the computer programmers into the classroom and teach the students, such things as historically black college endowment funds, such things as providing grants and scholarships to the best math and science students we have, and on a party-line vote because it was proposed by the President, the Democrats on the Education and Labor Committee today said, "We will not consider this legislation at this time."

#### PRESIDENT HAS BEEN AN AMBASSADOR TO CHINA, BUT NOT TO EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I think our problem is that the President has been an ambassador to China and never got to be an ambassador to any of the Europe countries. With the butchers of Beijing just having finished their executions, the President

sends off his top aides to China to find out how we can help the Chinese Government, those octogenarians who are oppressing their own people, stay in power; but the President wants to be cautious when it comes to Poland and Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovakians ravaged by the Nazis in World War II, taken by the Soviet Union, stripped of much of their industrial bases, fought back and has freedom, and we ought to provide a little incentive and help from American industry to be competitive in Eastern Europe.

There is an economic opportunity here for American industries. There is an economic opportunity that we are about to lose to the Germans and Japanese.

We can go so slow that we will be able maybe to get the crumbs in Eastern Europe; we are not going to have a chance to help American industry.

The Bush administration has already subsidized sales to the Soviet Union for grain. What it does, it helps American farmers compete with Western European farmers.

When it comes to telecommunications and computers, the Japanese have a tied-A program that is 34 times the size of ours, if you compare the countries for size. The Canadians have a four times program, a program four times the size of ours. The majority leader recognizes that the greatest threat to this country today is economic. We are losing the trade war and we are about to lose the best market in the world because this administration thinks the only place it can do business is in China.

□ 1230

#### SOVIET UNION NOT A POOR COUNTRY

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, experts remind us that the Soviet Union is not a poor country—it is a poorly managed country with enormous resources.

I was amazed to learn that the majority leader of this House is critical of the President for not supplying high-technology exports and economic aid to the Soviet Union.

Now, we all appreciate a little corrective criticism from time to time, but this President cannot be charged with "lack of leadership."

It was President Bush who went to Poland and Hungary months ago to offer assistance and moral support.

It was President Bush who met with Gorbachev in Malta. And following the summit, it was President Bush who began lifting trade barriers. He granted the changing Soviet Union most-favored-nation status.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush seized the day many months ago.

If Members of this body want to send high-level technology and United States hard currency to the Soviet Union when it remains unclear if Gorbachev will survive the month then they will have to answer to the American people.

#### MAJORITY LEADER'S SPEECH SHOULD BE HEEDED BY ALL

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged to hear Majority Leader DICK GEPHARDT's eloquent speech before the Center for National Policy. I hope his important message is read by all Americans.

Mr. GEPHARDT said that President Bush's military budget seemed as though it had been written by someone who had not read a newspaper in a year.

Why at this time when the cold war is over does Mr. Bush ask for a military budget \$6 billion more than last year?

Why a 23-percent increase in star wars, a 65-percent increase for the MX missile.

Why does the President refuse to liberalize high-technology trade to Russia?

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Mr. GEPHARDT's leadership and vision on this issue. His message should be listened to by all.

#### MEMBERS INVITED TO TRIBUTE TO JOSE NAPOLEON DUARTE

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, as we sit here debating this speech that was made by the majority leader yesterday about leadership or lack of it, I think it is very important for us to realize that amidst the euphoria that took place at the February 25 election in Nicaragua, that many of us have forgotten the fact that the great leader in the neighboring El Salvador, Jose Napoleon Duarte, passed on.

This afternoon at the end of legislative business, I have requested 1 hour, and I would like to invite our colleagues to join in talking about this brave and courageous leader who certainly was one of those who forged the way for the tremendous changes which we are seeing in Eastern Europe and other parts of the world. I hope that as many Members as possible will join us this afternoon.



### "WHAT IS WRONG WITH THIS PICTURE?"

(Mr. CHAPMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, as children we used to look at books, comic books, and so on, and play a game of "What is wrong with this picture?"

Members may recall something would be there that we had to identify that would be out of sync. I would like to ask my colleagues today, in this picture, what is wrong with the picture, when on a \$1,000 raise, an investment banker with a \$200,000 annual salary would pay an additional \$280 in taxes, while an auto mechanic with a \$27,000 salary would pay on a \$1,000 raise \$265.50 more in taxes? What is wrong when the richest Americans are paying a tax at only a fraction of what working middle-class Americans pay?

The administration has failed in its tax policies. After a decade of Republican deception about taxes, the truth is finally out. The richest Americans, the top 20 percent of the wage earners in this country, have received a tax cut of 5.5 percent, while the rest of America has paid increased taxes and pays increased taxes of 5.5 percent as a result of the administration's policies.

It is time that we in this Congress applied some fairness to the Tax Code, recognized working Americans have been carrying the load, and enact some legislation that recognizes their contribution as well as the wealthiest.

### FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE BILL

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to address the House 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, there has been an inexplicable resistance to the family and medical leave bill.

When asked, opponents of the bill give explanations that make no sense in this day and age, like: "I oppose mandates."

Does that mean they oppose child labor laws? Occupational health and safety laws? Social Security? That is a mandate. Mine safety? The minimum wage? Job-training programs, with all the restrictions they contain? Do they oppose all laws?

Clearly, minimum standards affecting working people are well established. Indeed, it can be said that every single law enacted by the U.S. Congress is a mandate of one kind or another, from clean air to the S&L bailout, from ethics reform to foreign aid.

Some opponents shrug their shoulders and imply there is no need for family and medical leave.

Someone commented that the opponents have a "yuppie mentality." Well, I do not know about that. But it got me thinking: Do they have no hearts or no heads?

I am not the wizard of oz, I cannot give tin men hearts or straw men brains.

But I will try to persuade those who misunderstand the issue or who have not yet focused on the issue.

Tomorrow, I will tell you about the New Jersey experience, where a bipartisan effort in the legislature produced a comprehensive family leave law that was enthusiastically signed into law by a Republican Governor in January of this year.

Stay tuned.

### INTRODUCTION OF THE AGRICULTURAL FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 1990

(Mr. HUCKABY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday 15 of my colleagues joined me in introducing the Agricultural Flexibility Act of 1990.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is much more responsive to the needs of American agriculture than the recent legislation proposed by the administration. It consists of four components. First, it updates agriculture yields to reflect realistically what farmers are making today on their individual farms. It allows farmers to build base in 3 years instead of 5 years. It eliminates cross-compliance, the provision that the administration has insisted upon having in prior years that prohibits farmers from planting other crops and responding to market demand. Finally, Mr. Speaker, our legislation allows the farmer to move 10 percent of his tillable acreage into any crop in response to market demands.

The bill provides flexibility while protecting the integrity of our individual agricultural commodities, and I look forward to making it an integral part of the 1990 farm bill.

### TO REPEAL THE ASBESTOS HAZARD EMERGENCY RESPONSE ACT OF 1986 AND STUDY THE ACTUAL HEALTH HAZARDS OF ASBESTOS

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the specifics of a bill I introduced today in the hopes of helping our Nation's school children, school districts and scientists to deal intelligently with the potential problems of asbestos.

Congress reacted in the mid-1980's to a poorly researched scare regarding the extent to which asbestos is a health hazard. Recent and comprehensive studies are telling us a different story.

Meanwhile, until more studies are completed—as this bill authorizes—our Nation's school children are being displaced from their schools while school districts and taxpayers pay for costly cleanups. And we do not know conclusively that those cleanups are necessary.

This according to recent scientific analyses: "Clearly the asbestos panic in the U.S. must be curtailed." In perspective, damage from exposure to asbestos in schools are estimated at .005 per million. EPA estimates the cost of the Asbestos Hazard Act at over \$52 billion. Realistic estimates are as high as \$150 billion.

And, as a sad note to the asbestos scare, there is evidence that the *Challenger* tragedy was caused by what has been termed asbestos paranoia. That fiery crash, according to some, could have been prevented if asbestos-based putty were used on the rocket boosters as a fire retardant.

If we throw our efforts behind trying to find out facts so that we can apply an effective cost benefit ratio to public health protection, instead of mandating measures that may not even be necessary, then we will be truly legislating.

I urge consideration of this bill.

□ 1240

### WHERE IS THE LEADERSHIP FOR THE FUTURE OF OUR COUNTRY?

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's history has been characterized by generations that felt an obligation to adopt progressive policies.

Sadly, it seems those traditional commitments have been forgotten today. Rather than controlling our own destiny by preparing for the new century, we are watching foreign investors buy up America.

The administration budget we have before us does nothing to reverse that trend—less for transportation, less for education, less for natural resource protection, and less for the children of this Nation. One child in three is not being immunized properly.

That list goes on and on. The point is: as we enter the final decade of the 20th century, we are faced with paying the bills for the decade of the eighties, as decade that saw our national debt triple and that saw our trade deficit make us a debtor nation.

As the most earth-shaking political developments in 50 years—some say in all of human history—unfold, where is the leadership with a vision for the future of our country—a leadership that continues the unselfish tradition of progressive policies for the future of this country and this world?

#### STEMMING THE TIDE OF DRUGS

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States declared war on drugs and on the drug dealers by the enactment of the Drug Abuse Act of 1988. Since that time we have been adding salvos to this declaration of war by various means, by providing more money according to the President's proposal for law enforcement, including the death penalty for drug dealers who insist on killing in the furtherance of their enterprises, money for other law enforcement measures, money for education of our young people and others who become victims of the scourge, and for rehabilitation for those who have already succumbed to the ravages of drugs.

Today we have taken another giant step in the introduction of legislation to beef up the salary scales of our soldiers in the field, the law enforcement agents who deal directly with the drug problem. This is just another way of saying to the American people that we are going to abide by your wishes to do something about the drug problem, to make sure that our young people will know enough to not only say no, as they are saying, but that their Congress and the other law enforcement people of the country are behind them in their effort to stem the tide of drugs.

#### AMERICANS ARE PAYING MORE AND GETTING LESS

(Mr. NAGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, it's no wonder President Bush wants America to read his lips. Otherwise we might read the bottom line of what his policies—and those of his predecessor—have done to working families over the past 10 years.

Over the last decade, tax rates for the very wealthy were cut in half. Working families got a 5.5-percent tax increase.

Today, if an Iowa school teacher got a \$1,000 raise, and a Drexel Burnham junk-bond executive got an extra \$1,000 tacked onto his multimillion dollar bonus as the company was crashing, it's the school teacher who pays a higher percentage of that additional \$1,000 in taxes.

At the same time, programs which serve working Americans have been consistently and deeply cut.

Today we invest from 20 to 70 percent less in roads, housing, jobs and employment training, economic development, and energy conservation than we did in 1980. We spend more in 2 years on weapons research and development at the Pentagon than we have invested in the past 100 years on biomedical research.

Simply put, after 10 years of Republican control of the White House, working Americans are paying much more for their Federal Government and getting much less.

#### MISSOURI STATE SENATOR RICHARD M. WEBSTER

(Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, funeral services will be held this afternoon on the campus of Missouri Southern State College in Joplin, MO, for State Senator Richard M. Webster.

Senator Webster, a longtime friend, was an outstanding member of the Missouri Legislature having served three terms in the house, presiding as speaker in 1954. He was elected to the State senate in 1962 where he served with distinction until his untimely death.

I offer my sincere regrets and condolences to his wife Janet and his two sons Richard, Jr. and William L. who is Missouri's attorney general and to all the other family members.

Dick Webster was an able, dedicated public servant. His work in behalf of our State will be sorely missed.

#### PRESENT TAX RATES UNFAIR

(Mr. DeFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in 1986 the Congress, with the strong urging of the Republican majority in the Senate and the President of the United States, adopted the so-called Tax Simplification and Reform Act.

Well, the third year returns are flooding in and it is pretty clear, it was not simplification and it was not reform. For the first time in history we have set an explicit tax rate, not one with loopholes which we know the rich have always had, but we have given them an explicit tax rate lower than that paid by many middle income two-earner families. There is a 15-percent bracket, 28 percent bracket, 33 percent bracket for many middle income Americans. But when you earn over \$200,000 a year you drop back down to 28 percent.

A family of four with two earners, a husband and wife in the work force, can pay a marginal tax rate as high as 41 percent when you add in Social Security taxes. How about Michael Milken, the \$500 million a year junk bond king? He pays at the rate of 28 percent. Is that equity? Is that progressive? No.

What is the President's answer? To heap insult onto injury and give another tax break targeted at the richest of the rich with his capital gains plan and ask middle class working Americans to pay again. No, Mr. President. No.

#### SUSTAIN PRESIDENT'S EASTERN AIRLINES VETO

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from the Houston Chronicle editorial of this morning.

The floor of Congress is no place to resolve labor disputes.

Congress should let stand President Bush's veto of a bill that would create a commission to investigate the struggle between unions and Eastern Airlines.

If Congress were to override the veto, the process of resolving Eastern's labor problems would be prolonged unnecessarily. Previous federal investigations and mediations have not resolved the dispute. Instead, collective bargaining has been impeded while the unions seek advantage through political channels.

Samuel K. Skinner, Secretary of the Department of Transportation, said, "Governmental intervention in this dispute is simply not justified." He said there is no transportation emergency as a result of the strike against Eastern, nor has there been a threat to aviation safety. Skinner said the dispute should be resolved in the courts.

The court-appointed examiner, David Shapiro, said creation of a forum outside the judicial process would create uncertainty. He said authorizing a commission would have disastrous effect on efforts to reinvigorate Eastern Airlines.

Congress has enough to do without trying to write labor contracts between unions and private enterprise. President Bush's veto should be sustained.

#### IT IS 45 DAYS TO EARTH DAY

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, in January I stood in the well and indicated to my colleagues that we began the countdown to Earth Day. April 22, 1990, is the 20th anniversary of Earth Day. We now have 45 days to go, Mr. Speaker, and we have a lot to do. We have to pass a good, solid Clean Air Act that cleans and protects America's environment.

We need, and I would ask my colleagues for support in adopting, a reso-



lution to call a White House conference on solid waste management and reduction.

I would also ask Members to look carefully at the tax incentives and other kinds of encouragement for the use of recycled fibers and the use of recycled material generally so we can help reduce the amount of solid waste in America.

To that extent, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work done back home in my district in the city of Louisville and the county of Jefferson.

Mayor Abramson, County Judge/Executive Armstrong, Deputy Mayor Joan Riehm, the city and county managers of our solid waste and environmental activities, Mr. Davidson and Ms. Waldrop, for the excellent work they are doing. I am proud of what they are doing.

I would say again we have but 45 days until the 20th anniversary of Earth Day. We have a lot of things important to the environment to do by that day.

#### PRESIDENT'S EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE ACT: WRONG PARTY, TOO POPULAR A PRESIDENT

(Mr. FAWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, for 1 year the President's Educational Excellence Act has languished in the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, of which I am a member. This morning the subcommittee summarily voted to postpone consideration of the bill.

□ 1250

Mr. Speaker, no one on the subcommittee did not support the initiative, which included, for instance, a \$250 million grant program for public and private schools serving educationally disadvantaged children. When those schools made substantial progress in raising their educational achievement, they would receive good grants. Rather, the objections of the majority, with the notable exception of the gentleman from California, Mr. HAWKINS, chairman of the committee, was that the bill, though good, was not good enough. They said it had doo-dads and window dressing.

The revealing reference though was that the President would pick up ill-deserved 30-second sound bites on the TV if the bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, the only reason the President's Educational Excellence Act did not pass out of the Elementary and Secondary Education Subcommittee this morning was a political one. Wrong party; too popular a President.

After witnessing this spectacle this morning, Mr. Speaker, I realize anew

why people in this country have such sour thoughts about the Congress as a body.

#### EASTERN AIRLINES

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in 1986 Eastern Airlines threw 10,000 American workers out on the street. But who cares: The American taxpayers will pick up the cost.

The boss of Eastern Airlines is Frank Lorenzo. Members should remember that name. He is the guy that wrecked Texas Air, and everybody around here is saying wait a minute, Frank Lorenzo and deregulation were absolutely necessary. I say if deregulation was so great, how come the airlines cannot find our luggage?

Deregulation gave us chapter 11, chapter 13, chapter 7, and chapter Lorenzo, and every chapter made a book that was bad for American history.

When Members vote today, just think of one thing: Would you want Frank Lorenzo doing repairs and maintenance on Air Force One? The American workers want us to say no to Lorenzo, so let us vote to override that veto today. Let's give a vote to our American workers.

#### EASTERN AIRLINES

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, as the preceding gentleman just indicated, we will a little later today be debating the question of whether or not to override the President's veto of the bill creating a Commission to look into the Eastern situation. I just want to make sure that this debate is going to be on the facts and not on speculation.

This morning on the radio coming in here I heard a high official of the International Association of Machinists say that the examiner in bankruptcy had found Eastern Airlines guilty of illegally diverting Eastern assets, but at the same time the examiner had found that Mr. Lorenzo was going to be let off the hook, and said that the reason we need the Commission was to look into what looked a little fishy. I just want to stress that the examiner found no such thing, that that is not accurate. In a letter he has written to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] he said:

I did not find that Texas Air had improperly diverted assets from Eastern. Instead, I set forth the grounds on which such a claim could be asserted. I did not make a judgment as to the validity of such a claim or its likelihood of success. In fact, my report

noted that Texas Air had substantial defenses to any such claim, and, in my opinion, Texas Air could very well prevail.

So I think we are going to have spirited and lively debate this afternoon. I just hope we can keep it to the facts.

#### PRESERVING OUR WETLANDS

(Mr. HAYES of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. Speaker, on the day that Jack Kennedy died, my father and I were hunting in a marsh in Vermillion Parish, LA, that no longer exists. During just the time that we have been listening to these 1-minute speeches, over 40 acres of the Nation's wetlands have been lost.

The extraordinarily rapid rate of over one-half million acres a year must be reversed in order to maintain the economic stability of much of not only the gulf coast of the State I represent, Louisiana, but the eastern shore of Maryland and the coast of California. Three-quarters of those lands are in the hands of private citizens.

At a time of budget constraints and the realities of the way to stretch a dollar, the proposal which I am introducing today allows those wetland owners, who know more about their property than any Federal agency ever will, to make improvements thereon with the proper authorization, permitting safe environmental practices, and receive a tax credit for 75 percent of that cost. It would result in reversal of a trend that must be reversed in order to protect what is in my area the largest wetlands in the world, and what is for America more than a natural resource of beauty and wonder, but an economic heartbeat.

In that vein, I appreciate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have joined me as cosponsors, and I look forward to the committee action and hearings which I hope result in a positive step in the right direction for the Nation's wetlands.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which should contribute to the debate over congressional campaign finance reform. The bill requires the FEC to make a matching payment, paid for by a checkoff on Federal income tax returns, for each contribution of up to \$1,000 to a congressional campaign from individuals who live in the contested district.

No PAC or other group donation would be eligible for the matching funds.

This would increase the influence of constituent donations, and at the same

time make it more attractive for candidates to raise funds within their own districts.

This bill contributes to congressional efforts to reform campaign financing.

We are moving in the direction of eliminating PAC's altogether, and I hope this bill will help facilitate that process.

#### GLOBAL ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1990

(Mr. SANGMEISTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you and many other of our colleagues had the opportunity to travel abroad this past session. Unless my experiences were unique, the majority of foreign officials and business leaders I encountered not only spoke English, but also displayed an impressive understanding of our culture and economy.

By our not bothering to learn about the language, culture, and geography of our major trading partners, we are losing our ability to compete in a global society. Over 80 percent of our goods currently face international competition and four out of five new jobs are created as a result of foreign trade. It's no surprise that many American firms are now hiring language-competent graduates from abroad. It is a surprise that one in seven American adults could not locate the United States on a world map.

Let's face it—we can no longer afford a generation of citizens uneducated and uninterested in the world outside the United States. If we want to remain a player, we have to adapt to the new rules. I rise today to introduce the Global Elementary Education Act of 1990. This legislation gives matching grants to States to train and retrain elementary school teachers in the areas of foreign language and culture, geography, and international studies.

Let us not make the nineties a decade of missed opportunities. Please join me in honoring "National Foreign Language Week" By cosponsoring the Global Elementary Education Act of 1990.

#### BLACK HATS IN THE EASTERN AIRLINES STRIKE

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, later on today we will begin considering legislation with regard to the Eastern Airlines strike, and there has been an indication here on the floor today that there is only one black hat in this whole process, and that is Frank Lor-

enzo. I would agree that he wears a black hat, but there are some other black hats, in fact, plenty of them to go around.

For example, we have in the International Association of Machinists who the New York Times has called one of the most militant and left leaning unions in the Nation.

According to Marshal Ingwerson, staff writer for the Christian Science Monitor:

The machinists hope to emerge from this strike with either full employee ownership of Eastern, or part ownership with a financial partner.

How do they intend to go about it? According to Charles Bryan, president of the eastern district of that union, he says, "We are in the midst of an all-out war on the employees of Eastern Airlines and their families."

How do they conduct that war? Let me tell my colleagues a few things. "Union strikers have deliberately harassed, threatened, intimidated, and assaulted Eastern employees and Eastern passengers. They have jammed radio communications between Eastern flights at the control tower of at least one major airport. They have sent bomb threats, made threats of arson, and threatened lives of working employees and their children," just the kind of people we would want to give an advantage to.

The special interest advantage that the Democrats would like to give to this union I think is disgusting.

□ 1300

#### TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION IS TYRANNY

(Mr. AKAKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, "taxation without representation is tyranny," said our great American Revolutionary James Otis in 1763. It was true then, and it is true today.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that the working family is not represented in the White House from whence come various tax proposals which weigh heaviest on the working family. A decade of Republican tax cuts have actually resulted in increases for everyone but the wealthiest few. There was a 5.5-percent tax cut for the richest fifth, and to be sure, to be equitable, a 5.5-percent increase for everyone else. I ask you, is this not an egregious wrong?

If you earn \$200,000 a year and get a \$1,000 raise, you pay \$280 in additional taxes. If you earn \$27,000 a year and get a \$1,000 raise, you pay \$365.50 in additional taxes. I ask you, Mr. President, is this fair?

I can only conclude that this is but a continuing effect of "taxation without representation," in the White House

for the working family. The last time this happened during the formative years of our country, we had a revolution.

#### NATIONAL CAPITAL CIVIL RIGHTS RESTORATION ACT OF 1990

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the National Capital Civil Rights Restoration Act, which represents the only practical and constitutional means of restoring to the citizens of our Nation's Capital full voting representation in the Congress. That proposal is a reasonable compromise between the repeal of home rule on the one hand and the adoption of D.C. statehood on the other.

Well, since then we have now heard from, among others, the Reverend Jesse Jackson, who has dismissed it in a typical knee-jerk rhetorical reaction. Apparently Jesse Jackson is willing to sacrifice the opportunity for D.C. residents to obtain full voting rights and end taxation without representation once and for all, in the interests of his own personal political ambitions. That may be good for Reverend Jackson, but it is an enormous price to pay for the people of this Nation's Capital.

#### THE CHINESE IDEOLOGY CAMPAIGN

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today Beijing Mayor Chen indicated that authorities are prepared to crush any new protests to commemorate last year's democracy movement demonstration. After defending last June's crackdown, Chen said authorities absolutely will not allow any repetition of last year's uprising. He refused to discuss security measures at his press conference but said, "Maybe we have increased the number of police and maybe not—but we have improved the quality."

In addition, Beijing has embarked on the most expensive propaganda campaign of a decade. The aim: To purge the country of disloyalty to the Communist regime. While the "Lei Feng" campaign purports to be directing its efforts toward the future good of China, the regime forces university students to reeducate themselves in work camps. In the last 3 weeks, 12 students at Beijing University have committed suicide. They apparently did not share the regime's vision of the future.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these developments and the State Department's



horrifying human rights report which was released at the end of February, I am very disappointed to inform the Congress that as of Friday the President had not yet published in the Federal Register the regulations which are necessary to protect Chinese students in America. Any regulation issued by the President must be published in the Federal Register in order to take effect.

So much for the much-touted administrative directive.

#### DON'T BLAME THE BUBBLE ON THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. FRENZEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of speakers in this well this afternoon speaking on the subject of taxation. The burden of their message has been that people of lower incomes are being penalized by the Tax Reform Act of 1986 because of a phenomenon known as the bubble. Because of the bubble, very rich people pay the marginal rate of 28 percent and people who are less rich pay at a marginal rate of 33 percent.

The fact is, however, that laying the blame at the White House is putting it in the wrong corner. The President, then-President Reagan, suggested tax reform with a three-step income tax that was progressive with income.

The people who put the bubble in were the other body. The people who ratified it, and voted for it, were the Members of this House. And, the party of the complainants, the Democrats, voted for the Tax Reform Act, about which they now complain, in larger proportions than did Republicans.

So do not try to blame this President. He did not do it. Do not blame the Republicans. They couldn't pass tax reform by themselves. Those of you who voted for it can take all the credit you want for the bubble.

#### NEW TAXES TO PAY FOR THE MULTIBILLION-DOLLAR ACID RAIN BILL

(Mr. APPLEGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, "Read my lips, no new taxes." I think that is a famous line that many people remember hearing on television.

Well, President Bush is now ready to rake us over the coals, so to speak, with new taxes, many new taxes to pay for the multibillion-dollar acid rain bill.

No new taxes? Come on, George, there is no free lunch. Big taxes are going to be paid, and tens of thou-

sands of jobs are going to be lost in the coal-producing and power-producing States.

Give us a break, George; we are paying for your sick savings and loans. Now we need your help.

#### COMMENDING DARLINGTON COUNTY COMMISSION ON AGING/SENIOR CITIZEN CENTER

(Mr. TALLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Darlington County Commission on Aging on their outstanding senior citizens center.

Several years ago, I stood on the front porch of an old house in Darlington overrun with poison ivy and very much in need of repairs. That house was to become this community's senior citizens center.

Through the efforts of every segment of the community, we were able to obtain a block grant for the funding of the restoration of this beautiful senior citizen center that opened its doors last October.

I am very pleased to have been a part of this community effort. Partnership in Action truly made this dream a reality for the people of Darlington.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER AND ELECTION OF MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SANGMEISTER) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 7, 1990.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to my recent appointment to the Committee on Armed Services, I hereby resign my seat from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology effective today.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. SMITH,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 352) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 352

Resolved, That Representative Rhodes of Arizona be and is hereby elected to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ESTABLISHING ORDER OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERSHIP ON COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 353) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 353

Resolved, That the order of Republican membership on the House Public Works and Transportation Committee shall be as follows: Mr. Hammerschmidt of Arkansas; Mr. Shuster of Pennsylvania; Mr. Stangeland of Minnesota; Mr. Clinger of Pennsylvania; Mr. McEwen of Ohio; Mr. Petri of Wisconsin; Mr. Packard of California; Mr. Boehlert of New York; Mr. Lightfoot of Iowa; Mr. Hastert of Illinois; Mr. Inhofe of Oklahoma; Mr. Ballenger of North Carolina; Mr. Upton of Michigan; Mr. Emerson of Missouri; Mr. Grant of Florida; Mr. Craig of Idaho; Mr. Duncan of Tennessee; Mr. Hancock of Missouri; and Mr. Cox of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ESTABLISHING EASTERN AIRLINES LABOR DISPUTES EMERGENCY BOARD—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 101-116)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON moves to discharge the Committee on Public Works and Transportation from further consideration of the veto message on the bill (H.R. 1231) to establish a commission to investigate and report respecting the dispute between Eastern Airlines and its collective bargaining units, and for other purposes.

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of November 21, 1989, at page H9625.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1310

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to discharge the Committee on Public Works and Transportation from further consideration of the veto message on H.R. 1231. Time is of the essence. The survival of Eastern Airlines is in doubt and this legislation can help facilitate an essential precondition to Eastern's survival; settlement of its longstanding labor disputes. The House should have an opportunity to

vote on this issue before it is too late. We cannot afford the delay which would result from further consideration of the bill by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

Eastern lost \$850 million last year and cannot survive much longer unless there is a dramatic turnaround. Resolving Eastern's longstanding labor disputes is the key to Eastern's financial revival. Until the labor disputes are resolved, Eastern's management and its employees will be preoccupied and will not be able to carry out the extraordinary efforts which will be needed to win passengers back to Eastern. Moreover, so long as there are picket lines at Eastern many members of the public will be unwilling to patronize the carrier because of sympathy with the striking employees and because of concerns that Eastern may not survive and could leave passengers who have made advance payments holding the bag.

In view of the long history of mistrust between Eastern and its employees, the labor disputes are not likely to be resolved through normal collective bargaining. The best hope of reaching a solution is that provided by H.R. 1231; an objective commission, appointed by bipartisan congressional leadership, which would make recommendations which Eastern and its employees could then accept. H.R. 1231 represents the last hope for restoring Eastern to the major competitor it once was.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion to discharge so we can proceed with consideration of overriding the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I will more fully explain later, I oppose this attempt to override the President's veto of H.R. 1231.

I oppose this bill because I do not believe it can contribute to the resolution of the dispute between labor and management at Eastern. Indeed, it will probably increase the parties unwillingness to bargain in the hopes that a congressional commission will rescue them. Moreover, this bill will cause uncertainty and adverse publicity for Eastern that could ruin that airline's efforts toward recovery.

Although I oppose the underlying bill, I will not oppose this motion to discharge our committee. I hope that we can lay this controversy to rest as soon as possible.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. McDermott). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H.R. 1231) to establish a commission to investigate and report respecting the dispute between Eastern Airlines and its collective-bargaining units, and for other purposes.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of general debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of overriding the veto.

I would first observe that this legislation would not have been necessary if the President had followed well-established precedent and accepted the March 1989 recommendation of the National Mediation Board that the President appoint an emergency board to investigate the dispute between Eastern and its machinists. The National Mediation Board had recommended creation of an emergency board in 34 previous airline labor disputes. In every case, these recommendations were accepted and five different Presidents appointed emergency boards. The Eastern case represents the first time a President has refused to accept a National Mediation Board recommendation for an emergency board in an airline labor dispute. I am convinced that if the President had accepted the National Mediation Board's recommendation, Eastern's labor disputes would have been settled long ago and the tragic events of the past year would not have occurred.

The failure to resolve the labor disputes has been disastrous for Eastern and its employees. Shortly after the strike, Eastern went into chapter II bankruptcy. Eastern has continued to operate, but in order to survive it has had to sell more than a billion dollars of its most valuable assets. About 18,000 of the workers who were employed by Eastern before the strike are now either on strike or on furlough.

The survival of even a reduced-sized Eastern is now in doubt. Eastern has not been able to attract enough passengers to make its post-strike operations profitable. In 1989 Eastern's

losses were a record \$850 million. Unless there is a dramatic turnaround, Eastern cannot survive much longer.

It is widely recognized that a key to Eastern's survival is the satisfactory resolution of its labor disputes. This was recognized by Eastern's unsecured creditors in the bankruptcy proceeding who made it a condition of their agreement to Eastern's reorganization plan that Eastern reach a satisfactory agreement with its pilots and its flight attendants. Unless labor peace can be restored, the public is going to continue to stay away from Eastern because of sympathy with striking employees, because of questions related to Eastern's newly hired pilots and mechanics, and because of the public's concern that Eastern may have to be liquidated and passengers who have made advance payments for tickets could be left holding the bag.

Labor peace is unlikely to be restored through the normal workings of collective bargaining. There is a long history of mistrust between the Frank Lorenzo management and Eastern's employees. These feelings will be intensified by the recent findings by the examiner in Eastern's bankruptcy case that there was a basis for claims that Frank Lorenzo's companies had improperly diverted as much as \$400 million in assets from Eastern in the period before Eastern's bankruptcy. The examiner noted that a senior member of the Lorenzo team had stated in June 1988 that the basic plan was that Continental would "cherry pick the core parts of the Eastern system and become in effect the substitute carrier." Quite an incredible admission.

This diversion of Eastern's assets will make it even more difficult to develop the atmosphere of trust needed for collective bargaining. In these unfortunate circumstances, the best hope that Eastern's labor disputes can be resolved is for an impartial third party to make recommendations which both sides can accept. This process would be set in motion by H.R. 1231, which provides for the appointment of a four-member Commission by bipartisan congressional leadership to make recommendations for resolving Eastern's labor disputes.

It was argued in the President's veto message, and I expect it to be repeated on the floor today, that this bill would interfere with Eastern's bankruptcy proceedings. I can assure my colleagues that this would not be the case. The recommendations of the Commission appointed under H.R. 1231 would not be binding on either the bankruptcy court or the parties to the dispute. On the other hand, the work of the Commission could help facilitate Eastern's emergence from bankruptcy by giving both management and labor objective recommenda-



tions which they could accept. If this occurs, Eastern may be able to survive and revive itself as a major carrier.

In sum, the time for saving Eastern is growing short. H.R. 1231 represents our last, best hope of resolving the labor disputes at Eastern airlines and reviving the carrier.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join with me in voting to override the President's veto.

□ 1320

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the veto of H.R. 1231 and urge this body to sustain the President's action.

As you know, the labor dispute at Eastern has been going on for a long time. The National Mediation Board [NMB] tried for more than a year to resolve the dispute but without success. However, this bill would give a commission only 45 days to recommend a solution. I do not believe that a commission can accomplish in 45 days what the professional mediators at the NMB were unable to accomplish in more than a year.

In addition to the Mediation Board's actions, the situation at Eastern has also been thoroughly investigated by the Department of Transportation, the Federal Aviation Administration, various congressional committees, and the bankruptcy court.

Just last week, the special bankruptcy court examiner completed a 7-month investigation of Eastern. This investigation responded fully to the many union allegations against Texas Air.

It should now be clear that the situation at Eastern has been thoroughly investigated and mediated. Nothing would be gained by creating another commission.

Not only would nothing be gained, but more importantly, passage of this bill could actually have an adverse impact on the survival of Eastern Airlines.

Eastern is already in a very precarious situation. Each time we pass a bill like this we send out negative signals to the traveling public about the situation at Eastern. This causes the airline's traffic to drop, revenue to decrease, and makes it that much more difficult for Eastern to emerge from bankruptcy.

Both the special bankruptcy court examiner and the Secretary of Transportation have stated that passage of this bill over the President's veto would hurt Eastern's chances for survival. The bankruptcy court examiner stated that creating the Commission called for by this bill could "so disrupt Eastern's business and its ability to sell tickets as to make its continued viability as an air carrier untenable."

Likewise, the Secretary expressed concern that this bill "would hinder saving Eastern Airlines and the jobs of its employees."

Furthermore, if we pass this bill, that will not be the end of it. You can be sure that the unions will be back in a few weeks asking us to mandate the recommendations of the Commission. That will just further exacerbate the situation at Eastern and drive the airline deeper into a financial hole.

For the sake of continued competition in the airline industry, the 20,000 people now employed by Eastern, and the 12,000 Eastern retirees, Congress should get out of the way and give the airline a chance to make it on its own. We should stop catering to those who are so vindictive that they would prefer to see the airline go down the drain rather than continue under current management.

I urge my colleagues to be honest with the former Eastern employees and admit to them that this bill will not solve their labor dispute. We must stop giving them false hopes of legislative salvation. It is time to lay this matter to rest by voting no and sustaining the President's veto. Only then, will both sides finally have the incentive to sit down and work out this dispute themselves.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for general debate purposes, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am really puzzled as to what Eastern Airlines, the White House, or the Department of Transportation has to fear from this non-binding piece of legislation. I could understand their opposition to the original bill that we reported out of committee and which this House passed because that bill had real bullets. We were shooting with real effect.

The result of that legislation, had it been signed and enacted into law or had the President's veto been overridden and had it become law, would have been the ultimate irony because it would have meant that the striking pilots, machinists, and flight attendants would have had to go back to work for Frank Lorenzo. And on the ultimate resolution, within less than 3 weeks of the decision of the fact-finding board, if the parties had not accepted the results, I am certain that Congress would have taken them up, as we did just 2 years ago on a railroad dispute, and enacted it into law, and that would again have meant they would be going back to work under Frank Lorenzo, but under much better terms and conditions, and undoubtedly we would have saved a major competitor in the airline industry in America. We would have prevented the piece-

meal dismantling of this one proud great air carrier. We would have benefited the traveling public.

But today we are faced with the rather modest proposition, to say the least, of a fact-finding commission balanced bipartisanly, two for two, with no partisan result from it, to just go in and find the facts and make recommendations for instituting a useful beneficial public policy for the future. And this would be nonbinding upon the President, upon the Department of Transportation, upon the Congress and upon Eastern Airlines.

What has anyone to fear from that? I suggest the only ones who have anything to fear from this bill are those who fear the truth and the facts.

Mr. Speaker, that is shameful. We ought to override the President's veto and at least give an opportunity for truth to be set before the American public.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote to override the President's veto, but I must confess that I have a feeling of deep sadness about the entire Eastern Airlines situation.

We have seen a great airline crippled, the airline that Eddie Rickenbacker made famous. We have seen families ground up between the machinists and management. We have seen both Charlie Bryant and Frank Lorenzo act in ways which were destructive of human beings, of young people who had hoped to go to college on money their parents had lost, of families many of whom had to sell their homes. It is truly a tragedy, and there is more than enough guilt to go around.

I would simply ask every Member to look at three goals as they decide how to vote today: To look at general policy, to look at the question of justice, and to look at how we can keep Eastern Airlines alive. I would urge the Members to look carefully beyond the letter the examiner sent with the examiner's report. This is the report, and I am going to put it on the desk over here so any Member who wants to can look at it for a few minutes. It is an extraordinarily revealing document. It does indicate that \$280 million was transferred to Texas Air in a situation which can at best be called questionable and at worst clearly indicating a willingness to loot Eastern Airlines on behalf of Frank Lorenzo.

I urge each of the Members to look at the facts, to weigh the balance of general policy, of justice for the workers, the pensioners, the stockholders, and the flying public, and also to consider the question of keeping the air-

line alive. There are thousands of jobs at stake in this situation, but there is also a question of national policy and of the right of people to expect their Government to look into situations such as this.

As for me, I have studied Eastern Airlines for 17 years, and I believe the Commission is more than justified, I have studied Frank Lorenzo for the last 6 years and I believe the Commission is more than justified, but in addition, I would urge the Commission not just to investigate the narrow parts of this case but also to investigate those cases of union violence. I want to know whether the safety of any passengers was endangered and whether Congress should step in with any legislative remedies for that situation as well.

□ 1330

So, Mr. Speaker, on balance, for a variety of reasons, I think a vote to override can be justified and is justified, and I would urge my colleagues to look at the entire report of the examiner.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Boscol].

Mr. BOSCO. Mr. Speaker, we have had some good lessons lately in the invisible hand theory of economics. Deregulate, laissez faire, hands off, caveat emptor. Things will take care of themselves. Well, we all just voted \$150 billion to bail out the savings and loan industry under that theory, and now the President wants us to apply a good dose of laissez faire to the airline industry. His theory is, "Let's take the biggest pirate in the industry, let's take management that has never profitably run an airline, let's take people that have caused two major bankruptcies in this industry, that have deprived thousands of people of their jobs, their health benefits, consumers of airline tickets; let's leave them alone because they're in the good hands of the bankruptcy courts."

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, in the Bankruptcy Court the examiner has just completed an exhaustive study for which his law firm charged over \$4 million and has determined that in 12 out of 15 cases of corporate malfeasance that were charged, in 12 out of 15 charges of milking, stripping, bilking, siphoning, stealing funds and equipment from Eastern Airlines; in 12 out of 15 instances there are grounds to believe that Frank Lorenzo and his corporate team acted improperly.

Mr. Speaker, what is the bankruptcy examiner's solution to all of this? You guessed it. The same as George Bush's—the invisible hand. The examiner suggests, "Let them pay back a little over half of what they stole, and we'll put them in the cockpit again."

Mr. Speaker, we might as well go to the Post Office, and rip down all the

posters on the wall of the bank robbers, and send them each a note and say, "If you'll pay back half of what you stole, we'll make you president of the bank."

There are a flurry of letters going around today from the examiner and the administration that suggest that this really is not a matter for Congress because it is in the courts and that it is not appropriate for our branch of Government. Mr. Speaker, one should ask, "Who put this matter in the courts to begin with? Who chose the courts to handle the matter? Who would rather have the courts handle this matter than the Congress? Was it a district attorney? Was it a grand jury? Was there an attorney general somewhere?"

No, Mr. Speaker, it was the very people who perpetrated the fraud to begin with who chose the forum that their wrongdoings should be judged in. The very people who committed the 12 acts of impropriety that milked Eastern Airlines dry and caused it to be bankrupt now supposedly have the power to deprive us of jurisdiction because they chose the Bankruptcy Court to hear their case.

It is patently preposterous to suggest that the Congress of the United States should be afraid to assert jurisdiction because the perpetrators of wrongdoing chose a different branch of government to help them out of their dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, do we want the invisible hand to destroy the airline industry as it has the savings and loan and other industries in this country? I say we do not. I say that it is time to override this veto and get on with the difficult task of helping put this airline together again, and, more important, of preventing this type of tragedy from happening in the future.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge the temptations before us today, the temptation to side with the genuine frustrations of labor, a temptation to enjoy the luxury of taking on Lorenzo when few would differ with whatever was said.

However, Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind my colleagues that along with the judiciary we are coequal branches of the Federal Government.

Is not the legislation before us unwarranted legislative interference with the judicial process? I submit that is our question, and, my colleagues, article I, section 8 of the Constitution requires uniform bankruptcy laws.

Mr. Speaker, this means obviously that we can legislate prospectively within this constraint. It is another matter for Congress to step in an ongoing bankruptcy case. The courts

should be permitted to act unfettered by congressional interference.

The U.S. trustee acted after the Bankruptcy Court ordered the appointment of an examiner. By law an examiner must be disinterested and appointed only after consultation with the interested parties.

The judgment of Examiner Shapiro is that H.R. 1231 can do no good, but it will do a great deal of harm. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, the recommendations of the examiner deserve great credence. The examiner claims the creation of an additional forum outside the judicial process would make Eastern's continued viability untenable.

Certainly our interest is for a successful reorganization. Employees, retirees, the public should be our concern, and, Mr. Speaker, this can best be realized by upholding the President's veto.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, more than one year has passed since the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers began its strike against Eastern Air Lines and nothing has changed. The machinists, pilots and flight attendants all have been unable to negotiate new collective-bargaining agreements with Eastern. Secretary Skinner testified before the subcommittee that Frank Lorenzo has misled him into believing that the strike would be short and painless because the pilots would cross the picket lines of the IAM. He was in error. Instead the battle continues with no end in sight and the future of Eastern remains in serious doubt.

The traveling public has understandably refused to support a carrier that is both bankrupt and at war with its employees. Moreover, Eastern's most recent financial results provide no evidence of a revival but clearly demonstrate further and possibly irreversible deterioration of this airline. In 1989 Eastern lost over \$850 million and in the fourth quarter alone suffered more than a quarter of a billion dollar loss.

Only last week the examiner, David I. Shapiro, appointed by the bankruptcy court at Eastern's request to investigate prepetition transactions between Eastern and Texas Air and its other affiliates said, in effect, that 13 out of 15 transactions being reviewed constituted fraudulent conveyances. In each transaction Shapiro determined that Texas Air had stripped Eastern of an asset for which it paid less than fair consideration. These transactions include Texas Air's acquisition of Eastern itself in 1986 as well as Lorenzo's purchase of the airline's computer reservations system, System One. Based



upon the System One deal alone Shapiro decided that Texas Air should pay Eastern as much as \$250 million. He concluded that the amount Lorenzo owed Eastern for all 13 fraudulent conveyances totaled more than \$400 million. However, in order to escape further judicial scrutiny Texas Air has agreed to pay Eastern \$280 million, of which only \$107 million will be in hard cash. The remaining amount consists primarily of reductions in prices paid by Eastern to Texas Air. Eastern, of course, will only realize the benefits of these cost adjustments if it is, in fact, operating during the next several years.

Although Texas Air ostensibly agreed to pay Eastern this paltry and possibly ephemeral sum it refused to agree to any mechanism that would protect the airline against future wrongdoing. Mr. Lorenzo thereby has free rein to resume his inter-corporate shenanigans including the upstreaming of cash and other assets from Eastern to Texas Air and Continental.

While Mr. Shapiro may rely upon this settlement agreement to oppose H.R. 1231 he, for whatever reasons has chosen to ignore both his own findings and Mr. Lorenzo's habit of renegotiating what has already been agreed to. First, the examiner cites in his summary that because of the "continuing danger of conflicts of interests" a monitoring system such as an independent Eastern board of directors should be established over which the bankruptcy court would have oversight jurisdiction. It is these conflicts that create the now desperate need for the critical assistance H.R. 1231 would bring to the resolution of this dispute.

Second, the Eastern Air Lines Unsecured Creditors Committee and now the examiner have been forced to realize that agreements with Mr. Lorenzo are at best short-lived. From the commencement of the bankruptcy case Eastern promised the committee and repeatedly represented to the Court that it would pay unsecured creditors 100 percent of their claims. That commitment has now vanished and in its place is an offer to pay only 50 percent of these claims. Many creditors have grave doubts that Eastern will ultimately be able to even pay this amount. Only one day after Shapiro filed with the Bankruptcy Court a settlement agreement with Texas Air concerning the fraudulent conveyance claims Texas Air announced that it had been "sand-bagged" and that this agreement had absolutely nothing to do with the examiner's findings. Once again Mr. Lorenzo was "slip sliding away" from an agreement. The blue ribbon panel will help ensure that once a resolution of this dispute is achieved it is permanent and not transitory.

This airline is at a crossroads. Members of Congress have a choice as to

which direction Eastern will take—either sit by and watch this once proud and valuable national resource disappear into thin air; or we can act, as we must, to save Eastern Air Lines now. The intervention of the Secretary of Labor in the coal fields was necessary to successfully bring industrial peace to the Pittston Co. and the coal industry. H.R. 1231 offers the last best hope that labor peace will be restored to Eastern and the airline industry. Only then will this airline once again enjoy the confidence of the traveling public. This legislation can take Eastern out of a tailspin and put it back on a flight path that ensures its revitalization.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the motion to override the President's veto of H.R. 1232, a bill which would establish a commission to help resolve the labor dispute between Eastern Airlines and its employees.

Eastern's employees watched helplessly as Eastern's parent company, Texas Air, vectored Eastern into bankruptcy and then continued to operate the airline during a strike supported by all of Eastern's unions.

Today, 18,000 Eastern employees are still out of work. It has been a painful year for them, and for airline passengers in the United States as a result of Texas Air's actions.

Today, it also appears that Texas Air may well be using the shield of the bankruptcy process to disassemble Eastern Airlines by liquidating its most valuable assets, such as the routes to Central and South America.

Mr. Speaker, Eastern Airlines has become a toy for corporate raiders to do with what they will. But for Eastern employees, the airline is their lives.

There was a time when Eastern Airlines represented jobs in the labor force, competition in the airline industry, and commerce in their cities.

Now, the world watches as Eastern continues to sink in a flurry of paper transactions. Today, its resources are depleted, its creditors have been left hanging, and its work force has an increasingly uncertain future.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a commission to resolve the Eastern labor dispute may be the only answer left at this late hour. A commission will not interfere with the bankruptcy process, and it could help save thousands of jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion to override the President's veto.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN], a distinguished member of our committee.

McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time. I do not think I will need the 5 minutes, but I think it is appropriate for us to begin with just a moment of history as to how we got to where we are today.

First of all, I would like to remind all of you that there was an election in 1989 for the head of the union in Miami in which the outgoing president of the local said:

The President of Eastern Airlines, Mr. Borman, did the most for Eastern Airlines in the 31 years that I have had an employee-employer relationship.

That was in 1980.

The following week later when the new president came on board, the new president, who is there to this day, said:

Eastern Airlines has resorted to illegal gangsterism in the labor relations policy. The gestapo tactics of Martin Ludwig Borman and his Nazi torched earth policy will not work for him or against this union leadership.

That was the immediate approach that the new machinists' president took upon assuming the control of the union in 1980.

Well, as you know, deregulation hit. Cut rate fares took place. 1981 was the PATCO controllers' strike in which flights were canceled, many of them.

In 1982, Eastern lost a lot of money. Seventy-five percent of all the fares had to be discounted.

As a result of other airlines doing what was necessary to survive, the pilots' union, the transport workers' union of the stewardesses, those who were nonunion, all agreed to do what was necessary to allow that company to survive. The pilots sacrificed. The flight attendants sacrificed. The non-union workers sacrificed, but the machinists, headed by Mr. Charlie Bryan here, refused to cooperate. So all of them said to Mr. Borman, he said, "Let's do what is necessary. If they want to go to a strike, we will support you." So that was the way the situation was set, until the bankers called Mr. Borman and said, "If you go to a strike in this difficult time of recession in 1982 with the fares and all the rest, we will pull your loan."

So the President of Eastern Airlines signed an agreement with the machinists, while everybody else was sacrificing, signed an agreement in 1982 for a 32-percent increase for the machinists.

Well, of course, that just sets chaos throughout the work force. In 1984 and 1985 they continued to have problems. In 1986 they went down to the same situation again. It was make or break.

Once again, they sat down at the table and the pilots did what was necessary for the company to survive. The flight attendants agreed to do the same thing; also those who were non-union, but the machinists refused to cooperate again.

Well, the president of the company had been talking with the international president of the machinists, and Mr. Wimpinger, the international president, said to Mr. Borman:

Look, your agreement is not with Charlie Bryan at 100. Your agreement is with the international union. When the time comes for Eastern to survive, you call me and we will do a deal that will allow Eastern to survive.

So it came down to the weekend. They were negotiating all hours of the night. It was now 2 o'clock in the morning. Charlie Bryan refused to agree. Everyone else was at the table saying that the company can survive. They break. They call Mr. Wimpinger who refused to take the call. He puts the No. 2 man, Mr. Peterpaul, on the phone. Peterpaul talks to Bryan. They all wait for the verdict.

Bryan walks back into the boardroom. He says:

Can't trust any of you. I'm not going to agree. We shouldn't sign. We are not going to make any concessions.

And in fact they sold the company to Lorenzo. With that, the Eastern Airlines that I used to work for, that great proud company, virtually ceased to exist. They had what they wanted. Charlie Bryan went out to the press conference and said:

Now finally we have got somebody who can run the company. We have somebody who knows how to run airlines. Instead of having astronauts, we have people who can run airlines. We have got Frank Lorenzo.

That was the person he wanted.

Then they continued their game. They continued to try to financially survive, selling assets and doing all the rest that we have seen.

For those of us who love Eastern and care about Eastern and for the families who have lost years and years of input and were there for their retirement and sacrificed for the company in hard times in the hope that Eastern would continue to survive, have seen it bounce back and forth like a hot potato between these two who are now in management and in labor.

Now having virtually destroyed the great company that once was, who do they turn to as a last resort? They want the Congress of the United States to pull the fat out of the fire.

Well, I wish it had not come to this. I would give anything in my heart if it had not come to this, but let me tell you this. This is not George Bush's fault. It is not the responsibility of the President to clean it up. For those who brought it to this place and pursued it to this moment and wanted to get

here, this is where you wanted to be, and now you can solve it, and do not ask the Congressman from Louisiana, Idaho and Iowa, to make their decisions for you.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DeFAZIO].

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have heard some interesting debate in an attempt to reconstrue constitutional construction to say that the hands of Congress are tied in this issue.

Another interesting historical recollection which leaves out the role of Mr. Lorenzo in destroying what was a viable airline when he did take it over, whatever led to that takeover, and today we are confronted with a difficult decision.

The debate this afternoon is not about labor management relations, however. It is about corporate recklessness and the ability of one man to carry out a personal vendetta against Eastern's unions and destroy a great airline built by thousands of Americans.

□ 1350

What we are talking about is not whether the Federal Government is getting involved in the collective-bargaining process. We are involved in the collective-bargaining process. It is about the failure of Federal agencies, the courts, and the Congress to protect the basic rights of Eastern employees and the interests of the traveling public.

Our Nation's bankruptcy laws were not intended to provide a shield for corporate terrorists and flimflam persons. They were not intended to be manipulated as part of a cynical corporate blueprint to cannibalize Eastern and break its unions.

The bankruptcy court is protecting the interests of Mr. Lorenzo and his creditors. But who is looking out for the workers and the traveling public? That is our job.

The ostensibly neutral court-appointed examiner certainly is not. He is too busy lobbying Congress against this measure. He might lose his next \$4 million in commission.

The President says he vetoed the bill because he did not want the Federal Government intervening in a labor dispute. If that is his position, let us be consistent. Why did Labor Secretary Dole go and intervene in the coal miners' strike against the Pittston Co.?

This legislation would establish a blue-ribbon commission to look into the causes of the strike at Eastern and look at ways to resolve it and look at the greater issues of deregulation, safety, and the future of the airline industry in America, nothing more.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: What is so

frightening about that? What is the harm in having a bipartisan factfinding third party look into the issue objectively?

The original bill would have required back to work under the National Emergency Board. The President ignored the recommendations of the Mediation Board. We did not have an emergency board. Our original legislation did not pass.

This legislation simply asks that we set up a factfinding panel. To do nothing here smacks of Government indifference at its worst.

Overriding the President's veto, it will not be the silver bullet. It will not resuscitate an airline that has been bled nearly to death by Mr. Lorenzo, but at a time when the airline industry is becoming increasingly consolidated and few large carriers are able to dominate the market, we cannot sit on our hands and watch one go down to just dissolution.

Eastern is not going to survive as long as the labor dispute continues. The public is not going to book flights on Eastern if they are worried about whether the airline is going to be in business in 3 weeks.

This measure provides our last hope of restoring Eastern as a competitive airline. I hope we are not too late.

I urge my colleagues to vote aye.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President today.

I can understand why some of my colleagues on the other side have an uncontrollable urge to bash the President. Frankly, I am a bit surprised that they seem to have this same urge to bash Secretary Skinner, because over the past several months my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have been involved in transportation issues have spoken only in glowing terms about Secretary Skinner, and indicate that they consider him one of the most outstanding Secretaries ever to serve in that position.

As we know, Secretary Skinner has implored this body to support the President on this issue and has said that it will be the final nail in the coffin of Eastern Airlines if we use this delaying tactic which we have before us today. So I am a bit surprised at that position.

But there is one person, one person deeply involved, who is not political, whom nobody can say he is trying to bash the President or he is trying to support the President, because he happens to be a Republican, and that person is the bankruptcy examiner appointed by the court. Mr. Shapiro, the man who has been immersed in this issue, who does not have a political



agenda, hidden or otherwise, has said and has advised us that:

Having spent the last 11 months as the court-appointed examiner in this bankruptcy, I can only urge that you not create a blue-ribbon panel. We are on the verge of resuscitating Eastern, and in my view a blue-ribbon panel will be disastrous to that effort to say nothing to duplicating the efforts.

And he goes on to say that he asks the Congress to permit the bankruptcy process to complete the remaining steps necessary to the successful reorganization of Eastern. He says:

I ask the Congress to act out of concern for the employees, the retirees, and the members of the general public who depend on the future existence of Eastern.

Mr. Speaker, let us set aside partisan politics. Let us support the President.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to override this veto. The President says there has been no transportation emergency as a result of this dispute. But he doesn't have to fly on an airline on the verge of collapse like the rest of America. He does not have to hear the horror stories of flight schedules gone haywire, or deal with the chaos of families and communities disrupted by the strike, or worry about the effects on passenger safety. If I had Air Force One, maybe I would not worry either.

The Government has an obligation to protect consumers and to protect the public safety. It also has an obligation to protect the rights of workers. There is precedent for intervening in labor disputes of this kind. The National Mediation Board recommended to the President that he intervene with an emergency board. But he chose not to.

This is not simply a private labor dispute. When the Frank Lorenzos of the world set out to systematically destroy unions and airlines in order to plunder their assets, it concerns all of us. Transportation is not a private or parochial concern. It is a vital part of our country's economy and crucial to the running of a country. I urge the President to rise above his partisan interests and protect the national interest and the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, last fall the leader of one of the world's greatest labor unions addressed this Congress. When he spoke here, Lech Walesa said that America had always given him hope and that he and the members of Solidarity had always looked to us for inspiration and support and as an example of a country that treats its workers fairly and with respect.

I hope they are not looking now. I hope they are not seeing how our Government, the Government that is supposed to be the beacon of opportunity and hope for the world, how our Gov-

ernment is just turning its back on the working men and women of this country.

What the management of Eastern Airlines has done is an injustice to every working American and I urge my colleagues to send that message to the President by overriding this veto.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the President's veto of H.R. 1231, a bill to establish a Commission to investigate and make recommendations regarding the settlement of the labor dispute between Eastern Airlines and its collective bargaining units.

Quite frankly, I believe that H.R. 1231, the Eastern Airlines bill, is simply another attack on Texas Air Corp., and on its employees, many of which I represent. It is obvious to me that many Members of this body do not like the business practices of Frank Lorenzo. However, I don't think I nor any of my colleagues were elected to this body to carry out personal vendettas through legislation.

If Frank Lorenzo has broken any laws, he should be prosecuted like any other businessman who shuns our laws. But, carving out special laws just because we do not approve of the business practices of one individual is bad legislating—it's just plain wrong.

Time after time, I hear Frank Lorenzo and Texas Air Corp. being blamed for the loss of jobs in the airline industry. I am no apologist for Frank Lorenzo, but I represent thousands of Continental employees who feel that they have jobs because Texas Air Corp. saved Continental from total financial collapse.

Continental filed bankruptcy with less than \$40 million in the bank. Restructuring was painful for many employees. I do not deny that. But, Continental emerged from bankruptcy 50 percent bigger than it had been prior to chapter 11, operating 147 aircraft versus 105 in 1983 and with 81 percent more seat capacity. Today there are 34,000 Continental employees—10,000 of them in the Houston area.

People Express was on the brink of bankruptcy when Continental purchased it in 1986. Had Continental not acquired and rebuilt People, thousands would have been without jobs and northern New Jersey would have been virtually without air service. Let us review the facts relative to Eastern.

Similarly, Eastern Airlines was on the brink of bankruptcy when Texas Air purchased it. Over the last decade Eastern had lost approximately \$1.5 billion. It is unfortunate that Eastern and its machinists union could not resolve their disputes and that the ensuing strike drove an already financially weak Eastern to bankruptcy. But, since its chapter 11 filing, Eastern has

been growing steadily stronger. It currently has 800 daily flights and nearly 20,000 employees. By next spring Eastern is projected to have 1,000 daily flights, virtually the same number as before the strike. Eastern has met and exceeded all FAA regulations and continues to work very closely with the FAA to ensure that all of its operations are the safest possible.

The future of Eastern is now properly within the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court. Even the bankruptcy court examiner, David Shapiro, appointed to protect the interests of the airlines creditors, its employees, and the general public, has urged Congress not to override the President's veto. He warns that enactment of this legislation would reverse the progress that has taken place and make it impossible for the parties to negotiate.

For 15 years Eastern has struggled in the face of seemingly insurmountable obstacles. For the first time in many years, the potential exists for a healthy, competitive airline without the crushing debt that hindered it for so long. The future of Eastern Airlines is where it should be, in the hands of the U.S. judicial system and in the hands of nearly 20,000 dedicated employees.

I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto of H.R. 1231.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the President on this veto override.

There are two very good reasons why Members should vote against overriding the President's veto. First, H.R. 1231 forces the President to intrude into private collective-bargaining negotiations that are now under the jurisdiction of a Federal bankruptcy judge and, second, H.R. 1231 represents a classic example of unnecessary duplication and Government waste.

When no transportation emergency exists, as it does not now, the President and the Congress have no role to play in labor disputes, even long and bitter disputes like the one taking place at Eastern Airlines.

No transportation emergency exists, and no commission or investigatory board is called for in this situation. The Congress should therefore respect the President's decision and sustain his veto, because anything less would establish another bad precedent of increased Government interference.

□ 1400

Since H.R. 1231 was introduced over a year ago, Eastern Airlines has filed for bankruptcy and is now under the jurisdiction of a bankruptcy court. Let

me repeat again what the judge over-seeing that case recently said:

We are on the verge of resuscitating Eastern, and in my view, a blue ribbon panel will be disastrous to that effort.

It is not only wrong to interfere in this labor dispute, it is a waste of money and it poses a real danger to the recovery of Eastern Airlines. Why is it a waste of taxpayer dollars? Because the bankruptcy court, the Department of Transportation, the National Mediation Board have already done thorough reviews of the Eastern Airlines dispute, and another study is not needed.

This is not a labor versus management issue, it is a good government versus bad government issue. I urge my colleagues to support the President.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, this is all about a battle, and let me tell Members what the battle is. Mr. Charles Bryan, president of the International Association of Machinists, Eastern District, put it this way in what he wrote in a bulletin back in 1986. He said:

We are in the midst of an all-out war on the employees of Eastern Airlines and their families.

Well, today we are fighting one more chapter in that all-out war. The battle is right here on the House floor. But let us think about what has happened in that battle up until now.

The testimony by the examiner before the bankruptcy judge, Mr. Shapiro, recently tells us something about that. I want to quote from what Mr. Shapiro said in that court.

He said:

The fact is that in terms of efforts to settle the strike and to bring the pilots, machinists, and flight attendants back to work, the unions blew it.

That is what the report says:

They blew it, and now they want to come into court and insist on a trustee. Their people are on the street and they want to put 17,000 more people on the street because they blew it. They also want to blow the retirement benefits for some of their own members, 12,000 retirees, because if this company goes down what will be gone are 17,000 more people, and what will be gone are the retirement benefits of 12,000 people, many of whom are members of ALPA.

That is where the battle has been fought thus far. Let me tell you about some of the tactics that have been used in that battle up until now. According to the court that examined the illegal union activities in the course of this strike, here is some of what happened.

The unions have intentionally shouted threats to Eastern passengers about their safety, including some

children that they went up to and said, "If you keep flying Eastern, you are going to die." They have defecated and urinated on curbside check-in desks, throwing eggs on the baggage service area, putting glue on locks, and placing garbage on the curbside conveyor system. They have thrown rocks and ball bearings into maintenance facilities and they have broken into cars and broken bus windows.

This is a strike which has used ugly tactics up until now. We ought not reward it on this floor today.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield all my remaining time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARNARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the exercise that we are involved in here this afternoon is a classic case of doing the wrong thing at the wrong time and for essentially the wrong reasons. I think it has become clear in the course of this debate if we really want to put Eastern out of business, and it is very likely if this Commission passes that is what will happen, then we would vote to override the President's veto.

But make no mistake about it. There are people who want to put Eastern out of business, who see that as the ultimate result of this protracted labor-management dispute.

Quoting from a high official in the International Association of Machinists, he said a year ago:

IAM is at war with Eastern, and will continue fighting even if the battle ultimately results in the collapse of the company.

So this is being presented, ladies and gentlemen, as perhaps if you vote to sustain the President, as being antilabor. I would suggest to Members that exactly the reverse is true.

David Shapiro has been quoted here extensively. He said in his report that the appointment of this Commission would likely put 17,000 men and women out of work that are presently working for Eastern. It would jeopardize the pensions of 12,000 other individuals who have retired from Eastern, many of whom are union members.

It would also, I think, put at risk other airlines. Continental Airlines would perhaps be called upon to satisfy the pension requirements of the Eastern employees.

This Commission is supposed to encourage competition in the airline industry. It has exactly the opposite

effect. It has the very real risk that you are going to put two airlines out of business.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad story. This whole episode has been a very sad story. I think there are no heroes, and there are plenty of villains. Two of those have been mentioned here today.

Clearly Frank Lorenzo, his management style is something we can all abhor and find fault with. By the same token, Charlie Bryan in his intransigence has also been definitely a contributor to this disaster. They are both hard-nosed, intransigent, inflexible people, and they share a lot of the blame for bringing us to the sad state of deterioration of Eastern Airlines.

But then there is the Congress. I think we also have to share a part of the blame here, because we have raised expectations, false expectations, that somehow we are going to come in riding in like the U.S. cavalry and save the situation.

That, Mr. Speaker, tended to defer any negotiations. There was no pressure on either labor or management to negotiate. So there is plenty of blame to go around.

The question now is, Can we make ourselves feel better, feel happier, if we override the President's veto? Well, perhaps we might feel a little better as a result of that. But Members have to ask themselves, will this Commission work? I think the answer to that is clearly no.

Consider what the Commission is required to do. They are required to make findings of fact and recommendations for settling this dispute. That is No. 1.

No. 2, they are expected to make policy recommendations to Congress and to the Department of Transportation concerning, first, the powers of the Secretary to intervene in labor-management's disputes, to ensure competition and survival.

Second, to make recommendations concerning the protection of employee bargaining rights in bankruptcy proceedings. And they are to do all this in 45 days.

You have heard here today the statement that the National Mediation Board had considered this thing for 500 days and was unable to resolve it. We have had the issue here in Congress with us, we have had it in the Department of Transportation, and the bankruptcy court has been wrestling with this thing for 7 months.

But this Commission, which by the way is only four members and therefore an invitation to deadlock, this Commission is supposed to resolve the whole thing in 45 days.

Mr. Speaker, it is ludicrous to think this issue can be resolved in that rapid a period of time. So, Mr. Speaker, I



would just urge Members to heed the words of the examiner who said:

I ask the Congress to act out of concern for the employees, the retirees and the members of the general public, who depend on the future existence of Eastern.

Defeat this motion and we will ensure I think the future of Eastern.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes, for purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the veto override of H.R. 1231. I rise today in the public's best interest and in the interest of labor-management relations across this Nation.

The progress of events throughout this whole Eastern Airlines ordeal has been pitiful at best. I am truly saddened that the President was unable to take the appropriate action so that so many Eastern Airline workers and staff would not have had to suffer as they did. I am additionally saddened by the foot-dragging approach taken by our own Labor Department after months and months of complaints.

Today, we must override the President's veto because Frank Lorenzo and his pals, in taking over Eastern, obviously intended only to exploit the workers and the company. The bottom line is that in hopes of a fair and just resolution we must vote to override.

We are faced with severe problems in labor-management relations. Workers, such as the Greyhound drivers, are suffering even today. It is my hope that these union-busting efforts adopted and utilized throughout the Reagan administration will not be perpetuated in the Bush administration.

I encourage my colleagues to vote in support of the veto override.

□ 1410

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of efforts to override the President's veto of H.R. 1231, legislation which would set up a bipartisan Commission to investigate and make recommendations on the labor dispute between Eastern Airlines and its unions.

Unlike the original version of H.R. 1231 which came before the House last year, this measure does not call for the President to declare that a national transportation emergency has occurred—one of the major stumbling blocks to my supporting the original bill.

Clearly such a transportation emergency has not happened. Other carriers have stepped in to fill the voids left by Eastern cutbacks, and the American public as a whole has not been too terribly inconvenienced by the matter although airlines in gener-

al are leaving much to be desired these days in the way of public service and accountability.

On the other hand, I am greatly troubled by many aspects of the Eastern situation—including recent reports that Frank Lorenzo had been siphoning assets back and forth between the many corners of his airline empire. Seems to me these types of actions are performed more for the benefit of the corporate bigshots—certainly not for the workers with vested interest in their pension plans or for the little stockholders.

The other day I spoke on the House floor about the Wild West attitude of some of these corporate executives—like those of Drexel, Burnham, Lambert—who apparently walked away with \$350 million in bonuses “just one step ahead of the posse” and less than 2 months before taking their own company into bankruptcy.

Something is rotten in corporate America, Mr. Speaker, when these activities are allowed to go forward with apparent impunity while the workers—in the case of Eastern Airlines, the thousands of unemployed strikers—are left out in the cold.

In this regard, the bipartisan Commission's investigation into the Eastern situation could have ramifications far beyond the Eastern situation alone. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the override of the President's veto of H.R. 1231.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the President's veto. This whole business of having the government intervene in labor-management disputes is troubling. There are well-established procedures for resolving such disputes and those were followed, albeit unsuccessfully, as Eastern's restructuring attempts unfolded. While we are sympathetic to the plight of Eastern's employees, this bill is not the solution.

The President was correct in his veto message that this legislation “would significantly disrupt chances for an orderly reorganization of Eastern by the court.” By establishing a commission to study this dispute, issue findings of fact and make recommendations for settlement, this bill would have not only been dangerous but probably unconstitutional as well.

Mr. Speaker, I note another aspect of the Eastern situation that has come to light in recent days—the report of the bankruptcy examiner that is highly critical of the numerous transactions between Eastern, Texas Air, and Continental. These allegedly improper asset transfers are significant. The examiner found that they ranged from \$285 to \$403 million.

Now, I don't believe Congress should make determinations on the magnitude of improper asset diversions any more than we should appoint fact-finding blue ribbon commissions. However, I do want this Congress to be on notice that an administrative law judge at the Department of Transportation has recently recommended that Eastern's sister carrier, Continental, be selected to receive very valuable international route authority between the

United States and Japan. Let me restate: At the same time this system of related air carriers is accused of improperly transferring assets, it stands ready to receive very valuable route authority from the U.S. Government. Continental's figures show that award could mean \$37.6 million in new profits for the Texas Air group.

While I am not fully aware of all considerations involving international route proceedings at the Department of Transportation, I do know that it makes no sense to give a major asset away to Continental Airlines in an environment where there is even a question about improper transfers of assets from Eastern, especially when solid air carriers are competing for the same route.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the President on this veto override. But I also think notice should be served that it makes no sense for the Department of Transportation to award valuable route authority to one of the Texas Air group of companies at this time.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding President Bush's veto of H.R. 1231. In overriding President Bush's veto of H.R. 1231, Congress will be taking steps that would reap both immediate and long term benefits. H.R. 1231 has the potential to solve, in the near future, Eastern's current labor dispute and restore Eastern to the status of a viable major airline competitor. In light of the current atmosphere of mutual distrust that has developed between Eastern and its employee representatives, it is unlikely that new labor agreements can be reached through the normal collective bargaining process. This bill is the only hope for a fair and responsible resolution to this unfortunate labor dispute.

In addition to its immediate consequences, H.R. 1231 will lay the groundwork for solving and preventing future debacles in the airline industry. The blue ribbon commission established by this legislation will consider general issues that have arisen out of Eastern's labor dispute. It will make policy recommendations to Congress and the Secretary of Transportation concerning the powers of the Secretary to intervene on behalf of the public interest to maintain competitiveness in the airline industry and the inadequacy of protection of employee collective bargaining rights in bankruptcy proceedings involving air carriers.

President Bush claims that he is neutral in this labor dispute. The Department of Defense, however, with certification from the Department of Labor, has recently granted a military courier service contract in the amount of \$120 million to Lorenzo and Eastern. I do not perceive the administration's awarding of a military contract to a strikebound carrier as an act of neutrality. Rather, I see it as direct Government intervention on the side of the employer.

Last week, the bankruptcy court examiner filed a voluminous report based on his 6-month investigation of Texas Air-Eastern pre-bankruptcy transactions. This report states that Frank Lorenzo's Texas Air holding company had drained up to \$400 million from Eastern Airlines by underpaying the airline for key assets, such as its reservation system and airport gates, and by overcharging for services, aircraft, and other transactions. The

report demonstrates the validity of Eastern employees' fears: Loranzo plans to rape Eastern of all its valuables and abandon the leftovers, including the unions.

I urge my colleagues to override the veto of H.R. 1231. Congress must help bring an end to Frank Lorenzo's misuse of the bankruptcy laws as a weapon against Eastern's employees. Overriding the veto will signal clearly Congress' disapproval of actions that violate responsible labor practices in the United States. Mr. Speaker, the record is clear. Mr. Lorenzo has no interest in the economic security of his employees. Congress must stand with the employees of Eastern Airlines in their quest to secure a fair, decent, and balanced collective bargaining agreement.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months, we have watched the management of Eastern Airlines use the chapter 11 Bankruptcy Code to jeopardize the companies unions and undermine the collective bargaining process.

We have seen the devastating effect that this has taken on the lives of thousands of Eastern Airline employees and their families—all because chairman Frank Lorenzo refused to engage in honest bargaining with the machinist union.

It is of utmost importance that we join together today in a bipartisan effort to override the President's veto of H.R. 1231, which would require the president to establish an emergency panel to investigate and help find a resolution to the Eastern Airline labor dispute.

Clearly, it is in the public's best interest to resolve this controversy, not only for economic reasons, but for passenger safety as well. Eastern Airline was our nation's sixth largest airline. We must end this dispute and return Eastern Airline as a major competitor in our Nation's airline industry. I am calling on my colleagues today to join me in overriding the President's veto of H.R. 1234.

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of overriding the President's veto of H.R. 1231, and direct bipartisan leadership to appoint a four-person commission to review the Eastern Airlines labor dispute.

Last week, a bankruptcy court examiner reported that Frank Lorenzo's holding company, Texas Air Corp., had unfairly drained \$403 million in assets from Eastern Airlines. Lorenzo has sold Eastern assets at below market value to his own Continental Airlines and has refused to bargain in good faith with striking workers, hiring replacements for a foundering Eastern.

Confidence in Eastern by the traveling public is dwindling. Striking Eastern employees and union members all over the country are losing faith in our Nation's management-biased system of labor relations that has been inspired by the last decade's prevalent disregard by management of the rights of working men and women. The disenchantment of working men and women has been compounded by the reluctance of their elected officials to get involved.

The political and economic climate of the 1980's encouraged a new aggressiveness on the part of employers who chose to simply ignore good-faith bargaining with striking work-

ers in favor of hiring replacements in dispute after dispute.

An override of the President's veto would send a clear signal that this Congress is concerned about the labor rights of working men and women. A bipartisan commission established to review the Eastern dispute would not only help to bring an end to this agonizing year-long strike, it would help to define the adequacy of protection given to employee collective bargaining in airline bankruptcy procedures.

An override of the President's veto would give both sides of this dispute objective recommendations from which they can resolve their differences. Also, in a much broader sense, it will set the tone for future labor relations in the airline industry and in the Nation as a whole.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of overriding the President's veto of H.R. 1231, the bill which would establish a commission to investigate the ongoing dispute between Frank Lorenzo and the workers of Eastern Airlines.

For reasons, I cannot begin to fathom, our kinder and gentler President wants to help Frank Lorenzo squander the resources of the once strong Eastern Airlines. This is beginning to be a trend for this administration, this habit of sitting back and watching while some rich and corrupt miscreants rape and pillage a company, such as a savings and loan institution, and then using our tax dollars to bail them out of their financial crisis. We are financing the savings and loan debacle after watching it grow to astronomical proportions over the course of several years. The administration is now prepared to sit back and watch Eastern Airlines get taken through the bankruptcy courts when we ought to have put a stop to Frank Lorenzo's corruption 2 years ago when he put his plan to break both Eastern and its unions into action.

Last week during Eastern's bankruptcy proceedings, a court-appointed bankruptcy examiner found that Frank Lorenzo had cheated Eastern Airlines out of millions of dollars for properties transferred from Eastern to his airline holding company, Texas Air. The list of transgressions the report cites is lengthy, faulting 12 of 15 transactions made transferring Eastern assets to Continental Airlines as well as having Eastern pay for its own acquisition by Texas Air.

In addition to Frank Lorenzo's siphoning off of Eastern's assets, and probably because of it, he insisted that Eastern workers accept major concessions during negotiations for their new contract including taking significant pay cuts, accepting changes in workplace rules, and allowing some work to be contracted out. Last week's report vindicates Eastern workers who have now been striking for 1 year because they assert that Frank Lorenzo has been gutting the airline of its most valuable assets. Thanks to Frank Lorenzo these workers have lost their livelihood, their homes, and had their standard of living drastically reduced during this yearlong struggle to save their airline.

We are not doing anything radical with this bill. We are not mandating change or dictating policy. In essence, this bill is a mere shadow of the original measure that we passed in this

Chamber 1 year ago next week. This bill has lost its teeth. The decisions made by the commission will not be binding on either side. Passage of this bill alone will not resolve this dispute. Yet, the administration still objects to it.

Mr. Speaker, only weeks ago we were all assembled in this Chamber to honor the great Polish Solidarity union leader Lech Walesa. At that time we all praised the union's movement in Poland and credited that movement with providing the strength to bring down the Communist government in that country and further the people's goal to create a freer society.

Why does this administration speak with two messages to unions? Why does the administration hail the unions in Poland and assail the unions in the United States?

The responsibility to correct this inequity now rests squarely on our shoulders and we must rise to meet the challenge.

By passing this bill, we will not require change, but show our support for an equitable examination of and support for a fair solution to the Eastern labor dispute. We will simply give the union and workers of Eastern Airlines the same support we gave the union and workers of Eastern Europe, and hopefully aid them in their struggle to save their jobs, earn a decent living, and provide for themselves and their families with dignity.

We should vote overwhelmingly to override the President's veto of H.R. 1231.

Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto of H.R. 1231, the Eastern Airlines Commission bill. The bill would establish a four-member Commission, appointed by the leaders in Congress of both parties, to investigate the labor disputes between Eastern Airlines and its three unions—IAM, ALPA, and TWU—and to make nonbinding recommendations for settlement. It would also examine several related public policy issues, such as competitiveness, and make recommendations to Congress and appropriate executive agencies regarding those issues.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation because I am convinced it is necessary. My Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation held a series of oversight hearings in 1987 on maintenance at Eastern Airlines, and what we learned was shocking.

Apparently, corporate cost-cutting and a cavalier attitude toward safety of the flying public impacted Eastern's maintenance practices to such a degree that literally hundreds of alleged maintenance violations were uncovered by the FAA. Eastern was fined and ultimately agreed to a \$9.5 million payment, the largest penalty ever collected by the FAA.

In 1988 my subcommittee called hearings to examine a plan by Texas Air Corp., Eastern's parent company, to subcontract Eastern's flight and maintenance operations to a little-known cargo carrier based in Raleigh, NC, known as Orion Air. That effort by Texas Air was an attempt to keep Eastern flying in the event that Eastern pilots decided to follow the machinists and go on strike.

Essentially, Texas Air was creating a scab airline with replacements that were virtually unknown. On its face, that move by Eastern and its parent company, Texas Air Corp., raised several safety and consumer concerns.



One concern was whether Orion could recruit and adequately train and supervise the pilots, flight attendants and mechanics that it needed to safely operate Eastern's airplanes. Another concern was whether it was acceptable for Eastern to lease aircraft to Orion which in turn relied heavily on a series of third parties for training and maintenance. Finally, there was a question of whether it was inherently deceptive to the public for Eastern to hand over passengers who booked flights on Eastern to Orion, with no real advance notice. Fortunately, the courts saw this subterfuge for what it was and abrogated Eastern's agreement with Orion.

The crisis at Eastern today exists for many complex reasons. Labor/management relations have been strained and confrontational for many years. The animosity and bitterness between Texas Air chairman Frank Lorenzo and Eastern's unions is well known.

It is also no secret that over the last couple of years Eastern has been taken apart piece by piece. Last year the airline lost \$850 million, and it appears that Frank Lorenzo continues to use the bankruptcy process to dismantle Eastern by selling its most valuable assets, including the Eastern shuttle, the computer reservation system and Eastern's lucrative Latin American routes.

It has now been a year since the machinists union struck Eastern Airlines, and the pilots and flight attendants withheld their services in support. A resolution of this dispute does not appear to be in sight. Unless Eastern's labor disputes can be resolved and labor peace restored, it is unlikely that the flying public will regain confidence in Eastern and that the airline will be able to rebuild its operation to anything approaching its former size.

What concerns me is that this will not only hurt Eastern's employees, but also the cities and communities it serves and the traveling public, which cannot afford to lose another competitor.

While I am not one to advocate congressional intervention in labor/management disputes, it is clear to me that, in this particular instance, a referee is needed. The proposed blue-ribbon Commission that is the subject of this vetoed bill would examine the conditions and circumstances that led to the crisis at Eastern Airlines and make recommendations that could lead to a settlement of its labor disputes and restore Eastern to the status of a viable major airline competitor. The Commission would also consider other issues that have arisen out of the dispute and make policy recommendations to Congress and the Secretary of Transportation concerning: First, the powers of the Secretary to intervene on behalf of the public interest to maintain competitiveness in the airline industry; and second, the adequacy of protection of employee collective-bargaining rights in bankruptcy proceedings involving air carriers.

These matters are indeed worthy of scrutiny by an impartial panel of respected citizens. It is difficult to envision how such a review could in any way adversely affect Eastern's condition as critics of this legislation have argued. Rather, if anything, it should help our decision-makers to learn from this tragic episode so that steps can be taken to avoid such calamities

in the future. I urge my colleagues to vote for an override of the veto of H.R. 1231.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the veto override of H.R. 1231.

I feel that the President was wrong in vetoing this legislation. Additionally, I believe it is imperative that a Commission be established to investigate and report on the continuing dispute between Eastern Airlines and its employees.

In the atmosphere of mutual distrust which has developed between Eastern and its employees, it is unlikely that new labor agreements can be reached through the normal collective-bargaining process. In these unfortunate circumstances, the best hope for resolving Eastern's labor disputes is to have an impartial third party make recommendations which both sides could accept.

The return of Eastern Airlines to full and normal operations is vital to our national interest, particularly in regard to passenger safety and the economic welfare of its employees and their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting an override to the President's veto.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield all of my remaining time to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] the minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARNARD). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to override President Bush's veto of this measure.

The key in this debate is "bankrupt." It describes the current position of Eastern Airlines, but it also vividly describes the bizarre idea that we are going to solve Eastern's problems through a commission.

Forming a commission is usually a sign in this House that we want desperately to do something, but we just do not know how and what to do.

The future of Eastern is currently and quite properly within the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court where the most sensitive and delicate proceedings are being undertaken.

The proponents of this legislation ask us to ignore the court and seek to duplicate its effort exactly at a time when we should show restraint and let the court do its work. We are asked to believe, as has been alluded to, that in 45 days a commission can solve a complex problem that the National Mediation Board could not solve in 500 days of sustained effort. Anyone who would believe that would believe anything.

Is there a national emergency which might justify congressional intrusion into a labor dispute? Why, of course not. No emergency exists. It has been months since the President's veto. If

the majority leadership thought an emergency existed, why did they wait so long to bring the veto to the floor, I would ask quite frankly?

So irresponsible is this course of action that David Shapiro, the court-appointed examiner in the Eastern Airlines bankruptcy, has written to me and to the Speaker, and of course I will include his letter at the conclusion of my remarks. He persuasively and in detail makes the case against creation of a commission.

In over 34 years in the Congress I have never heard of, let alone received, such a request from an examiner.

The court has powers to help the people involved, but a commission would have no such powers. H.R. 1231 sets up expectations of future congressional action precisely at a time when all parties should be committed to the court's approach. Why hold out false hope to those who have already been hurt so much?

In his letter to me, Mr. Shapiro refers to those whose interests are represented in the court proceedings. The number and variety of people whose interests and in some cases whose fate is now in the hands of the court are the creditors, preferred shareholders, employees, retirees, and yes, elderly folks from New York and Atlanta who can visit their children only by buying a low fare ticket on Eastern Airlines.

If, through creation of a commission, we give any one of those groups false hope for a solution outside the judicial process, we will have committed a grave injustice to every one of them concerned.

When I think of the damage that would be done to so many by such a measure, I am reminded of the words of the great old song: "Fools Rush in Where Angels Fear To Tread."

Let us not act like fools by stampeding into a judicial process that will be disruptive and distorted by our clumsy, ineffective action. Let us allow the court to do justice impartially, unimpeded by what could be our ham-handed interference. Let us help the court fairly meet the varying and complex needs of so many different people.

Certainly I would urge Members to vote no on the motion to override the President's veto of this legislation.

The letter referred to follows:

DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO & MORIN,  
Washington, DC, March 5, 1990.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: You have before you the question of overriding President Bush's veto of H.R. 1231, the proposed blue ribbon investigation of Eastern Air Lines. Having spent the last eleven months as the court-appointed Examiner in the Eastern Airlines' bankruptcy, I can only urge that you not create a blue ribbon panel. We are on the verge of resuscitating Eastern and, in my

view, a blue ribbon panel will be disastrous to that effort, to say nothing of duplicating ongoing court efforts.

When I was appointed Examiner, I was given a broad mandate to protect the public with regard to the Eastern reorganization. I wish to emphasize that I do not represent Texas Air or Mr. Lorenzo any more than I represent Mr. Copeland or ALPA. I have one constituency and that is the many interests that intersect in Judge Lifland's Court: creditors, preferred shareholders, employees, retirees, and elderly folks from New York and Atlanta who can visit their children only by buying a low fare ticket on Eastern Air Lines.

There are a number of reasons why H.R. 1231 is bad legislation.

(1) As my report (Vol. 1, pp. 40-48) shows: the unions have been willing to face up to the reality of hard collective bargaining in the hope that some outside body would rescue them. First, it was Ueberroth, then it was Ritchie, then it was H.R. 1231. When the Examiner urged the pilots to go back to work to maintain their jobs and seniority and continue to negotiate from the inside, he was accused of a "sell-out" to Lorenzo. When Jack Bavis, Chairman of the Eastern Pilots' Master Executive Council came to the conclusion that the only way to save the pilots' jobs was to return to work, he was removed from office and brought up on charges. (The charges were later dropped). It was only after H.R. 1231 was vetoed that the pilots and management got back to the bargaining table. Based on reports currently available to me, the negotiations have been inching along toward agreement. H.R. 1231 would reverse this process, create a further straw for the unions to clutch at, and make it impossible for the parties to settle.

(2) The Examiner's team (15 lawyers and a large support staff) spent more than six months looking at the various asset transfers; no Commission can do this job in 45 days.

(3) H.R. 1231 undermines the doctrine of separation of powers. The transactions which the panel would examine are *sub judice* in every respect; the panel would cover precisely the same ground. The Bankruptcy Court and the Examiner are objectively and fairly discharging their statutory obligations. It would therefore be an unwarranted legislative interference with the judicial process for the panel envisioned by H.R. 1231 to proceed as proposed.

(4) The creation of a second forum outside the judicial process to resolve Eastern's future creates uncertainty for an enterprise that no longer has the ability to withstand such shocks; it could therefore so disrupt Eastern's business and its ability to sell tickets as to make its continued viability as an air carrier untenable. This would result in the loss of jobs held by Eastern's present employees, some 17,000 people; destroy the pensions and health and medical benefits of its retired employees, some 12,000 people (mostly union members); and deprive the travelling public of yet another air carrier.

I am equally concerned that my report to the Court of last week has been misinterpreted in the press. Lest this report be improperly referred to in the forthcoming debate, I want to make sure that certain facts are clear.

I did not find that Texas Air had improperly diverted assets from Eastern. Instead, I set forth the grounds on which such a claim could be asserted. I did not make a judgment as to the validity of such a claim or its likelihood of success. In fact, my report

noted that Texas Air had substantial defenses to any such claim, and, in my opinion, Texas Air could very well prevail in any such litigation. My report stated that any legal action seeking recovery would have to plough new legal ground.

In short, as I stated in Court last Thursday, I did not find on the merits against Eastern, Continental or Texas Air. On the contrary, I issued the report contemporaneous with a settlement with Texas Air in an attempt to demonstrate that the settlement was fair, reasonable and adequate and in the best interests of Eastern. I further told the Court, "Maybe Texas Air and Continental would have won all twelve of the disputed issues, maybe six, maybe three, maybe none." Any legal judgment of wrongdoing by Eastern, Continental or Texas Air would have taken years of litigation with uncertain likelihood of success.

Another fact that should be firmly before the Congress involves the settlement with Texas Air. The settlement is not an admission of liability by Texas Air. Rather, it is an agreement between Texas Air and the Examiner as to what is needed to assure the economic viability of Eastern Air Lines. I frankly do not believe we could have gotten anywhere near the settlement, and its clear benefit to Eastern, unless Texas Air was committed to see Eastern through to a return to economic health. I therefore believe that that agreement demonstrates Texas Air's commitment to the future of Eastern.

Finally, whatever merit there is to the claims of "conflict of interest" and "self-dealing", the examiner has proposed that Eastern's reorganization plan contain provisions (such as, for example, a special independent committee of outside directors) for monitoring all intercorporate transactions between Eastern and Texas Air and its affiliates which are outside the regular course of business and have a value in excess of \$500,000. Accordingly, whatever concerns that continue to exist on this score will be dealt with in the Bankruptcy Court when it comes time for the Court to consider whether or not it should approve Eastern's plan of reorganization.

I do not believe that H.R. 1231 can do any good; it will, instead, do a great deal of harm. The bitterness between management and the unions should not be allowed to determine Eastern's fate. I therefore ask the Congress to permit the bankruptcy process to complete the remaining steps necessary to the successful reorganization of Eastern. I ask the Congress to act out of concern for the employees, retirees and members of the general public who depend on the future existence of Eastern. I ask the Congress not to enact H.R. 1231.

Sincerely,

DAVID I. SHAPIRO,  
Examiner.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself my remaining 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I think it is important to get the facts straight on what we are voting on.

A commission, a nonbinding commission. That is a commission whose recommendations are not obligatory on the President, the Secretary of Transportation, or the Congress. A commission which is bipartisan, which is to look into the dispute between Eastern Airlines and its employee unions, to make findings of fact on the dispute,

to make recommendations on how to prevent or avoid such disputes in the future, to make recommendations on the powers of the Secretary of Transportation to intervene in the public interest to maintain competitiveness in the airline industry, a useful review under any set of circumstances, particularly useful here, now in this period of the era of deregulation.

Who could be afraid of it? We have heard that disastrous results will come from this commission. It is like a popgun being aimed at a wolf. I have never heard anything so silly in my life, that this little commission that is going to make recommendations about the dispute between Eastern and its unions could bring disaster about.

A year ago, almost a year ago to the date when we were on the floor of this House debating a real bill to do something real about this dispute, something that would have had effective results, that would have put the unions back to work and kept Eastern in competition, we heard: "Don't pass this bill. Heavens, it will cost the airline \$1 million a day."

We would have done them a big favor if we had passed that bill, because on their own, under the protection of the bankruptcy court, Eastern has lost over \$850 million. They have done twice as good as the objectors predicted would have resulted had we passed that legislation. They said "\$1 million," and they have lost over \$2 million a day on their own, under protection of the bankruptcy court. That is a pretty sad state of affairs as far as I can see it.

As for the constitutional arguments, a simple study commission does not interfere with anybody's constitutional powers. Let us go back to the bill this House approved a year ago and the report of the American Law Division of the Library of Congress which concluded, after examining the constitutional questions raised about that legislation:

It cannot be persuasively argued that Eastern's filing under chapter 11 exempts it from continuing compliance with the Federal labor laws, or that compliance with those laws constitutes the taking of private property without compensation. . . we conclude that the subject legislation appears constitutionally sound.

Goodness, then this one surely is.

I must say, in all fairness, it has been a very, very respectful debate, and I must say that there has been, in contrast to the statements issued earlier, no secretary bashing. To disagree with the opinion of the Secretary of Transportation is not to bash him. We will have disagreements, and we have done so respectfully this afternoon.

But I did like my colleague from Pennsylvania's reference to the Congress coming in as the cavalry to resolve this dispute. I was hoping we would, and we did a year ago. We rode



into this Chamber, and by an impressive vote passed the bill that would have done something good and effective about this dispute. The trouble is, the cavalry ran into "Little Big Horn" down the corridor here in the other body, and out of that ambush came this modest, modest, greatly scaled down, poor image of itself bill that everyone says now, heavens, if we pass this bill, Eastern Airlines goes down in flames, and we have lost this great competitor in the airline industry. That reminds me of all of the Chicken Littles in the world gathered in one room complaining about a piece of the sky falling.

We have nothing to fear from a little bit of truth and a little bit of fact, and that is all we are asking for. Override the President's veto. Give a fair, impartial commission an opportunity to look at the facts, make some recommendations, no obligation on the President or the Secretary to do anything about it, no obligation on the Congress to do anything about it.

□ 1420

Maybe we will. Maybe hearings will be held on their recommendations and their findings. That is an issue for another day.

That issue will be decided on the merits of whatever this Board recommends to the public, to the President, to the Secretary and to the Congress.

All this debate is about one last measure of dignity and self-respect for the workers at Eastern Airlines who walked off their job in protection of their economic rights.

Let us override the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the motion to override the President's veto of H.R. 1231, to establish an emergency board to investigate and report the dispute between Eastern Airlines and its collective bargaining units.

It is important to remember that this bill was first passed at the recommendation of a National Mediation Board. The Mediation Board has advised the Chief Executive to appoint an emergency board 34 times this century; this is the first time a president has refused to comply with the Board's request.

Texas Air, Eastern's parent company, has a history of troubled labor relations. Following the acquisition of Continental Airlines, the company filed for bankruptcy and unilaterally terminated all union contracts. Since Frank Lorenzo took control of Eastern nearly \$900 million in assets have been sold off. A bankruptcy examiner has concluded that Texas Air has unfairly drained as much as \$400 million from Eastern Airlines during this dispute.

The mounting frustration and increased hostility at the airline make a successful resolution to the labor dispute virtually impossible. The proposed Commission's recommendations would not be binding to either Eastern or

the unions or interfere with the ongoing bankruptcy proceedings.

The Commission is also needed to examine and make policy recommendations concerning the Federal authority to intervene in airline mergers, acquisitions and bankruptcies which threaten airline competitiveness. As the airline industry continues to consolidate at the expense of competitiveness, it is absolutely vital that these broader issues be examined in order to protect the public interest.

In the interest of fairness and workers rights, this issue deserves a nonpartisan assessment by a presidential emergency board. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the override of the President's veto of this important legislation. Thank you.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the Presidential veto of H.R. 1231— to establish a four-member bipartisan commission to be appointed by Congress that would investigate and make recommendations to resolve the labor disputes between Eastern Airlines and its three unions.

I am disappointed that the President vetoed this timely and important legislation and I believe it is imperative that the House vote today to override. If President Bush had signed H.R. 1231 on November 21, 1989, instead of presenting his veto message, the investigation called for by the bill could now be complete and the recommendations made. Instead, Eastern Airlines 18,000 employees and their surrounding communities are suffering the ill effects of a protracted strike and the cities Eastern serves, and the traveling public, are in danger of losing still another major air carrier.

The administration has repeatedly stated that their objections to this bill center on their policy against intervening in the collective bargaining process. However, I maintain that the recent action by Labor Secretary Elizabeth Dole in the United Mine Workers strike against Pittston Co., is a strong example of why this legislation is warranted. The Secretary of Labor took full credit for her recent role in helping to negotiate a settlement in the coal workers dispute and I believe that the employees of Eastern Airlines deserve no less consideration by the administration.

The future of Eastern Airlines must remain an issue of concern to all of us. It is imperative that we bear in mind that Eastern was the sixth largest carrier in the United States handling more than 36 million passengers in 1988. Failure to end this dispute and restore Eastern as a major carrier would drastically undermine the competitiveness of our Nation's airline industry. An override of the President's veto of H.R. 1231 and the formation of a blue-ribbon panel to identify the cause of the disputes will help put Eastern back on its feet and restore it as a viable competitor.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting to override the Presidential veto of H.R. 1231.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARNARD). The question is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 261, nays 160, answered "present" 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—261

Ackerman	Geren	Nowak
Akaka	Gibbons	Oaker
Alexander	Gilman	Oberstar
Anderson	Gingrich	Obey
Andrews	Glickman	Olin
Annunzio	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Anthony	Gordon	Owens (NY)
Applegate	Gray	Owens (UT)
Aspin	Guarini	Pallone
Atkins	Hall (OH)	Panetta
AuCoin	Hamilton	Parris
Barnard	Harris	Patterson
Bates	Hatcher	Payne (NJ)
Bellenson	Hawkins	Payne (VA)
Bennett	Hayes (IL)	Pease
Berman	Hefner	Pelosi
Bevill	Hertel	Penny
Bilbray	Hoagland	Perkins
Boehrlert	Hochbrueckner	Pickett
Boggs	Horton	Porter
Bonior	Hoyer	Poshard
Borski	Hubbard	Price
Bosco	Hughes	Rahall
Boucher	Hutto	Rangel
Boxer	Jacobs	Richardson
Brennan	Jenkins	Ridge
Browder	Johnson (CT)	Rinaldo
Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Robinson
Bruce	Johnston	Roe
Bryant	Jones (GA)	Rose
Bustamante	Jones (NC)	Rostenkowski
Campbell (CO)	Jontz	Roukema
Cardin	Kanjorski	Rowland (CT)
Carper	Kaptur	Rowland (GA)
Carr	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Chapman	Kennedy	Russo
Clarke	Kennelly	Sabo
Clement	Kildee	Sangmeister
Coleman (MO)	Kleczka	Sarpalius
Coleman (TX)	Kolter	Savage
Collins	Kostmayer	Sawyer
Condit	LaFalce	Saxton
Conte	Lancaster	Scheuer
Cooper	Lantos	Schneider
Costello	Laughlin	Schroeder
Coyne	Lehman (CA)	Schumer
Crockett	Levin (MI)	Sharp
Darden	Levine (CA)	Sikorski
Davis	Lewis (GA)	Slisisky
de la Garza	Lipinski	Skaggs
DeFazio	Lloyd	Skelton
Dellums	Long	Slattery
Derrick	Lowe (NY)	Slaughter (NY)
Dicks	Luken, Thomas	Smith (FL)
Dingell	Machtley	Smith (IA)
Dixon	Manton	Smith (NJ)
Donnelly	Markey	Solarz
Dorgan (ND)	Martinez	Spratt
Downey	Matsui	Staggers
Durbin	Mavroules	Stallings
Dwyer	Mazzoli	Stark
Dymally	McCloskey	Stokes
Dyson	McCurdy	Studds
Early	McDade	Swift
Eckart	McDermott	Synar
Edwards (CA)	McGrath	Tallon
Engel	McHugh	Tanner
English	McMillen (MD)	Taylor
Erdreich	McNulty	Thomas (GA)
Espy	Mfume	Torres
Evans	Miller (CA)	Torricelli
Fascell	Mineta	Towns
Fazio	Moakley	Trafficant
Feighan	Mollohan	Traxler
Flake	Moody	Udall
Flippo	Morrison (CT)	Unsoeld
Foglietta	Mrazek	Vento
Ford (MI)	Murphy	Visclosky
Frank	Murtha	Volkmer
Frost	Nagle	Walgren
Gaydos	Natcher	Walsh
Gedjenson	Neal (MA)	Washington
Gephardt	Nelson	Watkins

Waxman	Whittaker	Wolpe
Weiss	Whitten	Wyden
Weldon	Williams	Yatron
Wheat	Wise	Young (AK)

## NAYS—160

Archer	Hastert	Quillen
Armey	Hefley	Ravenel
Baker	Henry	Ray
Ballenger	Herger	Regula
Bartlett	Hill	Rhodes
Barton	Holloway	Ritter
Bateman	Hopkins	Roberts
Bentley	Houghton	Rogers
Bereuter	Huckaby	Rohrabacher
Billirakis	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Billiey	Hyde	Roth
Broomfield	Inhofe	Saiki
Brown (CO)	Ireland	Schaefer
Buechner	James	Schiff
Bunning	Kasich	Schuetz
Burton	Kolbe	Schulze
Byron	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Callahan	Lagomarsino	Shaw
Chandler	Leach (IA)	Shays
Clinger	Leath (TX)	Shumway
Coble	Lehman (FL)	Shuster
Combest	Lent	Skeen
Coughlin	Lewis (CA)	Slaughter (VA)
Courter	Lewis (FL)	Smith (NE)
Cox	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Crane	Livingston	Smith (VT)
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Smith, Denny
DeLay	Lukens, Donald	(OR)
DeWine	Madigan	Smith, Robert
Dickinson	Marlenee	(NH)
Dorman (CA)	Martin (IL)	Smith, Robert
Douglas	Martin (NY)	(OR)
Dreier	McCandless	Snowe
Duncan	McCullum	Spence
Edwards (OK)	McCrery	Stangeland
Emerson	McEwen	Stearns
Fawell	McMillan (NC)	Stenholm
Fields	Meyers	Stump
Fish	Michel	Sundquist
Frenzel	Miller (OH)	Tauke
Gallely	Miller (WA)	Tauzin
Gallo	Montgomery	Thomas (CA)
Gekas	Moorhead	Thomas (WY)
Gillmor	Morella	Upton
Goodling	Morrison (WA)	Valentine
Goss	Myers	Vander Jagt
Gradison	Nielson	Vucanovich
Grandy	Oxley	Walker
Grant	Packard	Weber
Green	Parker	Wilson
Gunderson	Pashayan	Wolf
Hall (TX)	Paxon	Wyllie
Hammerschmidt	Petri	Young (FL)
Hancock	Pickle	
Hansen	Pursell	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Campbell (CA)

## NOT VOTING—9

Brooks	Craig	Neal (NC)
Clay	Ford (TN)	Solomon
Conyers	Hayes (LA)	Yates

□ 1445

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Yates and Mr. Ford of Tennessee for, with Mr. Craig against.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PORTER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I came to the House floor and voted to override President Bush's veto of H.R. 1231, to establish an Eastern Airlines Labor Disputes Emergency Board. However, for some reason my vote was not electronically recorded. I wish to make it clear that I did vote to override the President's veto.

I ask unanimous consent that this explanation be inserted immediately after the recorded vote on H.R. 1231 in the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## EXPLANATION OF PROCEDURE FOR OFFERING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3581, RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1989

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform Members that the Committee on Agriculture has requested a rule that would require amendments be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to the consideration of H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act of 1989. It is anticipated that the House will proceed to the consideration of the bill on Wednesday, March 14, 1990. Therefore, to fully protect their rights Members should have their amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than Tuesday, March 13, 1990. This should allow Members ample time to prepare and file their amendments.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute in order that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for the balance of the day and the week, and also what the prognostications are for the following week.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the business of the day is finished. On tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, the House will meet at 11, but there will not be legislative business.

On Friday, March 9, the House will not be in session.

Next week, on Monday, March 12, the House will meet at noon. No legislative business is scheduled.

On Tuesday, March 13, the House will meet at noon and will proceed to consider two bills under suspension of the rules:

H.R. 2843, to establish Kino Misions National Monument in the State of Arizona; and

H.R. 1347, Panama Canal Act Amendments of 1990.

On Wednesday, March 14, and Thursday, March 15, the House will meet at noon on Wednesday and at 11 a.m. on Thursday. Members should be advised that the official photograph will be taken immediately after the House convenes at noon on Wednesday. We will then be taking up, on both days, H.R. 3581, the Rural Economic Development Act, subject to a rule.

On Friday, March 16, the House will not be in session.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I might emphasize the point that was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Frost] with respect to the rule on Rural Economic Development, that any amendments that Members want to have considered will have to be printed in the RECORD by the close of business on Tuesday; is that not correct?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, that is the extent of any questions I have to ask, but I have one other thing: Later on in the month, on March 27, I believe, we will observe the Eisenhower Centennial Celebration, and it is my understanding that there has at least been tentative approval for a joint meeting that we might have on that date to commemorate the centennial of former President Eisenhower.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Yes, Mr. Speaker; we will work with the gentleman and with other Members on that arrangement.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman.

I have no further questions, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1450

## ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1990, TO MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1990

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, March 8, 1990, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, March 12, 1990.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. PATTERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.



# HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1990

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, March 13, 1990, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, March 14, 1990.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

# DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

# REPORT ON OPERATION OF SECTION 232 OF THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962—MES- SAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to the provisions of section 232(e)(2) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1862(d)(2)), I transmit herewith the report on the operation of section 232 of the act during fiscal year 1989.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 7, 1990.

# COMMEMORATING THE CENTEN- NIAL OF THE CREATION OF YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 398) to commemorate the centennial of the creation by Congress of Yosemite National Park, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for an explanation of House Joint Resolution 398.

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to

commend the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN], for this effort to recognize the creation of Yosemite National Park with a grant in 1864, and, since that time, the work that has been done in creating a pioneering park management within Yosemite National Park. It was established for purposes of preservation of the resources that contribute to its uniqueness and its attractiveness, and, whereas the Congress recognized the importance of this undertaking, I think it is important that we share that recognition today and use this occasion to commemorate its centennial.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I also want to acknowledge the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] is a cosponsor of this legislation. I support the legislation and urge its adoption.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 398, a bill to commemorate the centennial of the creation by Congress of Yosemite National Park. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

I have the great honor to represent Yosemite National Park—a premier national park and World Heritage Site. Last year, I introduced this legislation to help celebrate President Benjamin Harrison's decision, on October 1, 1890, to sign into law an act that set aside "reserved forest lands" surrounding Yosemite Valley. It is this date which has been formally recognized as the establishment of Yosemite as a national park for all the people of the United States.

In addition to commemorating the creation of the park, my legislation also pays tribute to what I believe is the finest national park in America. Covering over 1,200 square miles, Yosemite National Park lies in the Sierra Nevada mountains in Central California with the San Joaquin Valley to the west and the Great Basin to the east. Yosemite contains the headwaters of the Tuolumne and Merced Rivers and is known worldwide for such landmarks as Half Dome, Bridalveil Fall, El Capitan and, of course, Yosemite Valley itself.

Yosemite's history and its geography are stories of the American people and our relationship to the landscape. As Yosemite's 100th birthday approaches, it is time to reread these stories of our past so that we can apply their lessons to our future.

John Muir came to Yosemite in the 1860's and was among the first to recognize that Yosemite Valley was a product of glacier movement. He described glaciers as nature's landscape architects, saying: "Here are the roots of all the life of the valleys, and here more simply than elsewhere is the eternal flux of Nature manifested. Ice changing to water, lakes to meadows, and mountains to plains." Muir noted: "God's glacial mills grind slowly, but they have been kept in motion long enough in California to grind sufficient soil for a glorious abundance of life \* \* \*."

Historians say that Native Americans first inhabited the magnificent landscape of Yosemite and the Sierra about 3,000 years ago. An-

cestors of the Sierra Miwok, known as the Ahwahneechee or Yosemite Indians, entered higher elevations of the Sierra from the Central Valley of California. Non-Indian adventurers did not arrive until 1833 when, it is believed, the famous Joseph Walker party skirted the cliffs of Yosemite Valley in search of new fur-trapping territory. In 1851 Major James D. Savage led the Mariposa Battalion into Yosemite Valley in pursuit of Indians.

The first tourists came to Yosemite in 1855 with a party organized by James M. Hutchings, who was the publisher of California Magazine. Hutchings' visit marked the beginning of Yosemite as an attraction for nature lovers and tourists. One of those early visitors to Yosemite was Horace Greeley, who wrote: "I know no single wonder of Nature on Earth which can claim a superiority over Yosemite." Landscape painters such as Albert Bierstadt and Thomas Moran lent their talents to idealized portraits of Yosemite and photographers such as C.C. Weed and Carleton Watkins exhibited their Yosemite works in New York galleries. It was only a matter of time until both protection and promotion of Yosemite became a cause of California and for the Nation.

Although Yosemite's official birthday is October 1, 1890, when Congress designated the region surrounding Yosemite Valley as a reserve, in a symbolic sense Yosemite is the first and oldest national park in the world. In 1864, a businessman wrote California Senator John Conness to request that he introduce a bill to preserve Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Grove of Giant Sequoias—"to prevent occupation and especially to preserve the trees in the Valley from destruction." On June 30, 1864 President Abraham Lincoln signed into law the first scenic reservation in America for public enjoyment, which came to be known as the Yosemite grant. The Federal Government granted Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Big Trees, covering 60 square miles, to the State of California to preserve the area's outstanding scenic qualities. This first set-aside of land at Yosemite by the U.S. Government was the birth of the national park system idea and the birth of State park systems throughout America.

California administration of Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Big Trees continued until 1905-06 when California relinquished its ownership and President Theodore Roosevelt signed a Federal law accepting the return of the Yosemite grant. The Yosemite grant was thus combined with the 1890 backcountry Federal forest reserve to constitute Yosemite National Park.

The years when Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Grove were administered by California State commissioners were controversial ones. Yosemite Valley was a laboratory for the development of park management and conservation practices, and the results were often mixed. Frederick Law Olmsted was the first chairman, of the Board of Yosemite Commissioners, and in 1866 the California legislature appropriated the sum of \$2000 for the management of the Yosemite grant. In the decade preceding the grant, total visitation to Yosemite Valley barely exceeded 600 persons for the entire period. Ten years after the Yo-

semite grant, visitation rose to 2,700 persons annually.

Complaints about Yosemite management were numerous, and reading about them more than a hundred years later gives one a very strong sense of *deja vu*. Access to and within the park was a serious problem, as were visitor accommodations. In order to generate revenue for visitor services and park improvements, lands and buildings were leased to private individuals. Yosemite's manager, known as the Guardian, was accused of favoritism in granting privileges and leases at Yosemite. River courses were changed and meadows were drained to allow cultivation in Yosemite valley. Magnificent trees were cut to improve vistas and portions of the valley floor were fenced with barbed wire. Enormous controversy arose over the Yosemite Commission's efforts to divest the valley floor of settlers. Hotel proprietors were accused of pooling to boost rates.

Objections were voiced to the Yosemite Commission's park expansion proposal by individuals who feared State control of future central California water sources because of domination on the Yosemite board by southern California and San Francisco interests. John Muir came to Yosemite Valley during the State grant years and condemned the commercialism in Yosemite Valley—from fenced pastures to damage by sheep and lumbermen.

Eventually discontent with California's administration of the Yosemite Grant led to creation of the U.S. Forest Reserve surrounding Yosemite Valley, and for 16 years dual management coexisted. Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Grove became a park within a park, with the valley and grove administered by State commissioners and the backcountry administered by the U.S. Army.

On October 1, 1990, we will celebrate the official creation of Yosemite National Park. We will acknowledge that the last 100 years of park administration have not been perfect and that most of today's problems have ancestors dating from the 19th century.

Over the course of the last 100 years at Yosemite, the size of Yosemite has diminished to accommodate mining and timber potential and to eliminate most private inholdings. Management policies at Yosemite have fluctuated—trying to walk the precarious tightrope between visitor use and preservation of the natural environment. In 1907, a bold U.S. Army major at Yosemite received permission from the Secretary of the Interior to ban automobiles from the park. Today, with annual visitation exceeding 3 million people, automobiles probably represent the single biggest threat to Yosemite National Park.

In 1913, the U.S. Congress enacted the Raker Act which allowed the construction of O'Shaughnessy Dam and the massive Hetch Hetchy hydroelectric system within the park. In 1988, Congress enacted new legislation to prohibit any expansion of the Hetch Hetchy reservoirs in Yosemite. Today Yosemite's prime concessioner is criticized for contributing to the urbanization of the park. At various times in the past, Yosemite embraced such anomalies as a petting zoo, a dance hall, a race track for Indian Field Days and a firefall from Glacier Point during evening park programs.

Through all the variations of State and Federal, military and civilian management, Yosemite National Park has survived the 19th and 20th centuries and has given millions of American families countless hours of enjoyment. The park's interpretive services, its museum and its education programs have served as models for all of our national parks. Yosemite was said to be the favorite park of Stephen Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service, who set about making Yosemite the showplace of the National Park Service.

Americans have much to celebrate during Yosemite's centennial; as we approach the 21st century at Yosemite, we have even more to contemplate. The challenge of natural preservation in concert with public use at Yosemite have existed from the very beginning. In the late 1920's and 1930's, Yosemite Park Superintendent Charles Goff Thomson summed up these challenges very well. Thomson described it as reconciling two conflicting objectives \* \* \* "First, the National Park Service is controlled by an earnest determination to preserve the parks for posterity \* \* \* "Our second responsibility," Thomson said, \* \* \* "is to make Yosemite as useful as possible to the people of this generation \* \* \*".

I urge my colleagues to join with me in commemoration of Yosemite National Park and our National Park Service whose very roots lie in this grand Sierra Nevada landscape.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

#### H.J. RES. 398

Whereas the first application of a park concept originated in Yosemite with the grant of 1864 (Federal land given to California for preservation) and since that time the park has played an important role in pioneering park management concepts;

Whereas Yosemite National Park was established for the purpose of preservation of the resources that contribute to its uniqueness and attractiveness;

Whereas the United States Congress recognized the importance of preserving this great park for future public enjoyment when it established Yosemite National Park;

Whereas Yosemite National Park is a showcase of spectacular geological features, including the greatest concentration of granite domes in the world and the largest exposed granite monolith in the world;

Whereas Yosemite National Park possesses outstanding recreational values and supreme scenic attractions, including alpine and subalpine wilderness, three groves of giant sequoia trees and thundering waterfalls that are among the world's highest;

Whereas Yosemite was the birthplace of the idea of the Sierra Club;

Whereas Yosemite plays an important role in wildlife preservation and preserving biological diversity;

Whereas Yosemite is a world heritage site which has made a significant contribution to California's cultural heritage, to the national park movement, and to Yosemite's 4,000 years of cultural heritage by Native Americans;

Whereas Yosemite provides solitude and inspiration and serves as an outdoor classroom for environmental education;

Whereas each year Yosemite National Park welcomes millions of people from around the world; and

Whereas Yosemite National Park was established on October 1, 1890, and is the Nation's third oldest national park: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Congress hereby recognizes and commemorates the centennial of Yosemite National Park, created by Congress in 1890. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the centennial with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HARRIET TUBMAN DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 257) to designate March 10, 1990, as "Harriet Tubman Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I will yield to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER]. However, Madam Speaker, before I yield to him, I would like to say that Harriet Tubman owned a home in Auburn, NY, which is in my district.

Harriet Tubman is highly regarded in upstate New York, especially with regard to the Women's Rights Historic Park which is located in Seneca Falls and is not too far away from Albany, NY.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

Mr. CARPER. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, I appreciate very much what the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] has said, and I found in the last several weeks, as I have sought to enlist cosponsors of this resolution, that Harriet Tubman was not just a woman, a former slave born in Bucktown, MD, who made an impression and left an impact on that State, and not just a former slave who lived a few years and left an impact of some significance in my State of Delaware, not just a woman who left an imprint in the State of New York where she died in the year 1913, not just a woman who left an imprint in Massachusetts where there are buildings and memorials to her, not just a woman



who left her imprint in the 20 States that have honored her by making this March 10 Harriet Tubman Day, but she has literally emblazoned her name in the history books of our country.

Madam Speaker, I think all of us, all of us in this body, would like to think that we might somehow leave a legacy so that 50, or 100 or 150 years from now, when we are no longer on this earth, people still remember us for what we have done.

If there is someone from my part of the country that I would want us to remember, it is Harriet Tubman, a woman born in 1820 in a State neighboring ours, the Eastern Shore of Maryland, a woman who was born into slavery, but later became a conductor on the underground railroad that led to the freedom of hundreds of people enslaved in this country in the 19th century. She became a conductor and led nearly 20 trains as a conductor. She led slaves to their freedom prior to the Civil War. She became an eloquent and effective spokesperson on behalf of the movement to abolish slavery. In the Civil War she served as a soldier. She served as a spy. She served as a nurse, a scout, a cook and, as a leader, in working with newly free slaves. After the war she lived for another 50, almost 60, years, and in those years she continued to fight for basic human dignity, for the rights of all of us, for the opportunity that our Constitution requires.

Madam Speaker, Harriet Tubman is a lady that we are going to remember on March 10. We will remember her in my State of Delaware. We will remember her in the States where there are high schools named after her, elementary schools named after her, junior high schools named after her, colleges named after her, where there are statues, and where there are not, and wherever there are people who today enjoy their freedom regardless of the color of their skin. They and we owe a special debt of gratitude to Harriet Tubman whose memory we commemorate with this resolution, and to each of the 218 Members who have joined me as cosponsors, I would like to say to each of them, Democrats and Republicans, men and women, black and white, "Thank you very much."

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I am in support of House Joint Resolution 479, and I join with the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER] in urging its adoption.

Madame Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

#### S.J. Res. 257

Whereas Harriet Ross Tubman was born into slavery in Bucktown, Maryland, in or around the year 1820;

Whereas she escaped slavery in 1849 and became a "conductor" on the Underground Railroad;

Whereas she undertook a reported nineteen trips as a conductor, endeavoring despite great hardship and great danger to lead hundreds of slaves to freedom;

Whereas Harriet Tubman became an eloquent and effective speaker on behalf of the movement to abolish slavery;

Whereas she served in the Civil War as a soldier, spy, nurse, scout, and cook, and as a leader in working with newly freed slaves;

Whereas after the war, she continued to fight for human dignity, human rights, opportunity, and justice; and

Whereas Harriet Tubman—whose courageous and dedicated pursuit of the promise of American ideals and common principles of humanity continues to serve and inspire all people who cherish freedom—died at her home in Auburn, New York, on March 10, 1913: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 10, 1990 be designated as "Harriet Tubman Day," to be observed by the people of the United States with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

#### DEAF AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Madame Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 227) to designate March 11 through March 17, 1990, as "Deaf Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. PATTERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HORTON. Reserving the right to object, Madam Speaker, and I do not object, I support the legislation, and I would like to simply state that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered and I would urge its adoption.

Madame Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

#### S.J. Res. 227

Whereas during the second week of March 1988, a revolutionary sequence of historic social events evolved on the campus of Gallaudet University, the only university in the

Nation which teaches exclusively deaf and hard of hearing students;

Whereas the events which occurred at Gallaudet University in the Spring of 1988 had great significance to all Americans, especially those who are deaf or hard of hearing;

Whereas the week long social protest at Gallaudet University awakened the people of nations around the world to the fact that deaf and hard of hearing individuals are able to achieve at the same level as others and need to be recognized as individuals with unique abilities and qualities; and

Whereas the week long social protest at Gallaudet University served to educate and sensitize the American people concerning the hopes and dreams of the twenty-four million Americans who are deaf or hard of hearing. Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 11 through March 17, 1990, is designated as "Deaf Awareness Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this week by remembering the significance of the historic social movement, which began in March 1988 at Gallaudet University, through appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Joint Resolution 398, Senate Joint Resolution 257, and Senate Joint Resolution 227, the joint resolutions just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1231, the bill which was considered earlier today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### HOUSING PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, when we passed the bill last year at the request of the administration dealing with the crisis that resulted from the failure of some of these savings and

loans, we included amendments, and I see the chairman of the Banking Committee here who very much took the lead in this, to try to help people of low- and moderate-income who needed housing. We believed that we had a rare opportunity here to show the Government's acquisition of a housing stock as a result of these financial troubles could be used in an efficient manner to provide housing for people who very much needed it. One of the things we did specifically was to take an idea that the Secretary of Housing, our former colleague, Mr. Kemp had pushed, and include specific provisions for home ownership for low-income people; that is, we said let us take the inventory that the Federal Government now owns, and in some cases where the housing is inexpensive, let us make a special effort to make it available to low-income people.

Sadly, this administration has been fighting that provision almost from the day we announced it. They fought our efforts to make it a part of the bill, and sadly, even more so, they have not given up the fight.

As we meet today, the administration continues to resist implementation of that program. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, which we in the Congress put on to the board that runs this program, has been doing well, but the Treasury has been resistant in an extraordinary degree.

It has reached the point, Madam Speaker, where the League of Cities of the United States, a representative broad-based organization representing the municipalities of this country, at their meeting this week voted a specific resolution asking this Congress to cease any further cooperation with the Resolution Trust Corporation, the entity in charge of the savings and loan crisis, until they begin to administer in good faith this housing program. In other words, the administration stands in what seems to me the unenviable position morally of having asked us to provide the funds to deal with the savings and loan bailout and turning around and refusing to implement reasonable provisions adopted by a bipartisan vote to help low- and moderate-income people. When the League of Cities takes the position that we have gone beyond simple differences of opinion, but we have reached the point of absolute noncooperation, and they ask us, and they are a very responsible organization, when they ask us in effect to stop the RTC from functioning until they begin to carry out the program, I hope people will take notice.

There is a broader point here as well. When we originally put through that amendment, we were told by the administration it was too rigid and they asked for more flexibility. Tragically, they are using that flexibility,

not in good faith, but to frustrate the program.

An administration which asks for discretion and then abuses that discretion so that you get organizations like the League of Cities or the National Council of State Housing Authorities complaining very angrily about that, that is going to make many of us much more unwilling to grant discretion in the future.

We are only asking this administration to follow the lead of their own Housing and Urban Development Department, which is the most responsive to the housing crisis, and take advantage of this fact that we have a great deal of housing and make it available.

I commend the League of Cities for their diligence. I admire their willingness to take this kind of a tough position, and I hope the administration will understand the justice of the position of the League of Cities and will abandon this effort to undermine this important provision.

Madam Speaker, I append to my remarks today the specific language and the wording of that resolution, as follows:

Eighth, we urge Congress to reject any increased borrowing or spending for the savings and loan bailout, for working capital or any other purpose, unless and until the Federal Government works directly with cities and States to meet the affordable housing and community reinvestment goals and objectives set out in the law.

#### TRIBUTE TO ALDERMAN VITO MARZULLO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Honorable Vito Marzullo, former alderman in the Chicago City Council, who died at age 92, on Monday, March 5, after a long and distinguished career in public service to the people of the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois.

Vito and I were very good friends, and I shall always cherish his advice, his political judgment, and his sense of humor. He will be sorely missed by all of the people in the city of Chicago, especially by the Italian-American community, which he so tirelessly served.

Vito Marzullo was born in Senerchia, Italy, on September 10, 1897, and as a young boy moved with his family to the West Side of Chicago in May 1910. He lived all of his life in this neighborhood, which he dearly loved, and dedicated his life to public service for his community.

Beginning his political career as a precinct captain in 1920, he also worked as a clerk in the county treasurer's office, as a section foreman in the city's street department, and as a municipal court deputy bailiff. He also served as a representative in the Illinois General Assembly from 1940 through 1954.

Vito Marzullo, however, will best be remembered for his dedicated service as alderman

and as committeeman for the people of the 25th ward in Chicago. He served as ward committeeman from 1956 until 1984, and as alderman from 1953 until his retirement in 1986. His power in the Chicago City Council was legendary, and he was highly respected by both Democrats and Republicans for his knowledge of the neighborhoods which he represented, and his unshakable desire to improve the lives of its residents.

Vito Marzullo contributed greatly to the rich and diverse history of the politics of the city of Chicago, and his death is a tremendous loss to the people who knew him, and the people whom he served.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Annunzio and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Letizia, his sons, William and Robert, his four daughters, Helen Dimperio, Adeline Maiorano, Ann De Maria, and Eleanor Masciola, and the other members of his family who survive him.

#### VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING OF NEW SPECIAL ORDER

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a 60-minute special order today and replace it with one for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### TIME TO REVIEW PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, recent statistics show that there are more black males in prison than there are in college.

These figures are alarming.

I cannot offer reasons, but I would like to say that, a couple of years ago, officials at Morgan State University, a school in Baltimore with a high minority enrollment, asked me to help them obtain funding from the department of education. The money would have been used for upgrading the dorms.

I went in the dorms: they were a disgrace. I was appalled. In fact when I described them to business people and others, they could not believe the horrible description.

But, at that time, Federal funding was unavailable.

The State of Maryland will soon be aiding Morgan, but the students couldn't wait and, yesterday, they took over Morgan's administration building because of living conditions—including rats as roommates.

I invite the Secretary of Education and the director of the Bureau of Prisons to go to Allenwood Prison, and then, come to Morgan State.



I find it inexcusable that living conditions at a Federal prison should be better than those at a school for higher learning.

Funding needs to be spent in education and in training our work force. Only a nation that reads, thinks, and knows how to compute will be able to compete in the technological 21st century.

□ 1510

#### FOREIGN POLICY: TIMIDITY AND VISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. PATTERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I want to talk today about foreign policy, timidity and vision, and I was impressed, as I announced in my 1-minute earlier, with the daring of the Democratic majority leader in the House in charging yesterday that the United States is failing to capitalize on the sweeping changes in Eastern Europe because of what he called President Bush's timid, unimaginative leadership.

I wanted to propose three things. The first, that the Democratic Party's record in foreign policy over the last quarter century is hardly the sort of base from which to propose somebody else's needs to be more bold and more risk-taking. The second is that in fact President Bush has been doing rather well, if we measure by results, and, third, that we are in fact, as Jim Pinkerton said in his speech to the World Future Society, in the process of developing a new paradigm.

I encourage any of my colleagues, Democrat or Republican, who would like to share some of this time during this hour, because after I get through a few minutes of outlining this, I will be glad to open it up for anyone to debate.

It is interesting to note that while apparently the Democratic majority leader was proposing United States aid to the Soviet Union, that not even all the Democrats agree. Let me quote from this morning's Washington Post:

"Not only have the Soviets not requested U.S. aid," observed Senator Bradley, Democrat of New Jersey, "any assistance would be wasted absent fundamental reform of the Soviet economy. Unless they reform the economy, any economic aid is going down a rathole," Bradley said.

I think that is fascinating at two levels. First of all, I know that many people in the Democratic Party believe in giving away money whenever possible, but I think to suggest that giving money to the Soviet Union before they ask for it is a bit too premature.

I think Senator BRADLEY put his finger on what should be one of the

key tests to examining how we help Eastern Europe. If Communist dictatorships, as they democratize, insist on keeping socialism, insist on keeping bureaucracies, insist on blocking the emergence of the fundamental principles of sound economy, then, in fact, they are not going to work. The reality is that there are principles which make for economic growth, and that private property, free markets, incentives, encouraging take-home pay, keeping taxes low, encouraging saving and investing, being part of the world market, having a sound dollar or sound currency are very, very important, that they cannot get economic growth without following the basic principles.

In fact, ironically, those Third World countries which have listened to the advocates of the bureaucratic welfare state and listened to the advocates of the values of the left have essentially not done very well. They have often done very, very badly in economic growth.

Those Third World countries, Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and South Korea being the finest examples in terms of economic growth, who have followed the basic principles of encouraging private property, encouraging private investment, encouraging competition in the world market; those countries have, in fact, had dramatic growth.

The fascinating suggestion that we should somehow prop up Communist bureaucracies is interesting, and I assume that it was meant seriously. But I do not see how it works.

Gorbachev's primary problem is how to find the moral courage to shift to private property. The fact is that while there are a tremendous number of paper rubles in the Soviet Union, there is nothing to buy, and if the Soviet Government were to offer to sell housing to the people so they owned their own housing, if the Soviet Government were prepared to sell farms to the farmers so they could own their farms, if the Soviet Government was prepared to sell factories and offices so people could own the means of production, they would absorb most of the ruble overhang by having people invest it and then they would not have a risk of inflation. Until Gorbachev and the Soviets are prepared to establish the rule of law in private property and free markets, to set up a tax system which encourages the right kind of investment, no amount of American foreign aid would help.

But there is a second factor. Not only would it be, as Senator BRADLEY said, throwing economic aid down a rathole to send economic aid to the Soviet Union, as the Democratic majority leader suggested, but in addition, propping up Communist bureaucracies in Eastern Europe is the worst

possible strategy if we believe in democracy and if we truly want to help people.

The fact is that the Democratic majority leader in his speech on page 2 talked about 1848. I used to teach history, and I think 1848 is a very important year. If we look at it, he said:

It is absolutely essential that we be guided by the constellation of democratic values. 1848 was called the springtime of nations.

For those of us who studied history, that is a very revealing concept, because in fact 1848 was a period of popular movement toward democracy. It was repressed in Hungary by the Russians, by the Czar. It was repressed in Germany and led ultimately to the founding of the Prussian Empire, and it was in many ways the democratic revolution that failed.

I recently heard Henry Kissinger, a historian and political scientist, talk about the danger of 1990 becoming another 1848, and he meant it not in the positive sense of the Democratic majority leader. He meant it instead as a warning in the sense that if we are not very careful, the Communist bureaucracies in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union will retain the power to crush the democracies and, in fact, while there has been political power transferred so that we now have a playwright who is President of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Havel, he does not necessarily control all the bureaucracy. The very same Communist bureaucrats who were in office 10 years ago, 15 years ago are still in office in most of these countries, and for us to decide to send the taxpayers' money to prop up a Communist bureaucracy, that is, government-to-government aid, could well be, in fact, exactly the wrong policy.

What we should be saying to these countries is, "We want to encourage you to get involved in the world market. We want to encourage you to set up private property. We want to encourage you to set up a tax system which, by the way, would include a very low capital gains tax rate." If these various countries decide they want economic growth, they will probably end up with a lower capital gains tax than the United States has. And so I think the principles matter.

Let me say two other quick things. Second, I found it fascinating that a Democratic Party leader would decide to compete with George Bush on foreign policy, would decide to suggest that President Bush was somehow being too timid or was lacking vision. My memory of the modern Democratic Party is of a foreign policy that verges on being destructive.

I think if we look at the Bay of Pigs in the early 1960's under a Democratic President, if we look at the Vietnam war in the late 1960's under a Democratic President, if we look at the Ira-

nian hostage crisis, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the collapse of Nicaragua into a Communist dictatorship under a Democratic President, it does, indeed, take a certain amount ofchutzpah for a Democratic leader to jump up and suggest that we should take more risks, because it seems to me that President Bush has been remarkably successful in helping Nicaragua become free, in helping Panama become free, Eastern Europe become free, without, in fact, taking radical risks which are not necessary.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, the gentleman has discussed things in his usual interesting style, and I would only ask the gentleman, without going into a debate on the question of what happens in the Soviet Union, because that is, of course, a debatable matter at this point, but I am troubled by what he is saying about Eastern Europe. It sounds like the gentleman would just abandon Eastern Europe, would just say that we have these new democratic movements and let them just fail, let us not try and help them at all. That certainly is not where the American public is.

The American public is very proud, proud of what has happened in Poland, and that was clear when Lech Walesa came and addressed this Congress and went to Chicago and went to some of the other major cities in this country. The American public was very proud when President Havel came and he gave a most impressive speech to this Congress.

I cannot believe that I am hearing what this gentleman is saying, that he would just abandon these countries and let these fledgling democracies fail by being so timid that we would not offer them some help.

We all understand that we have budgetary problems in this country. No one is suggesting there should be a blank check. But there is some opportunity, there is some opportunity to play a very direct and constructive role to help the first possibility for democracy in those countries in over 40 years.

□ 1520

I can't think anything could be worse for the world than for us to stand idly by and let those countries revert, revert back to a totalitarian system. I am just surprised that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] would say that there is no role for us to play in Eastern Europe.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I may reclaim my time, let me just say first of all to my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Frost], that I do not believe in America that the only way we can

help democracies emerge is by maximizing government aid.

Mr. FROST. It is not a question of maximizing. The gentleman is saying we should not provide aid.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I may just make this one point, let me talk about the comment of the gentleman from Texas. I do not think the gentleman understands.

Mr. FROST. I heard the words.

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the Democratic majority leader, said yesterday, talking to the American people, "The reason they oppose increased investment in democracy in that region," meaning East Germany, and that is just not true. The American people want investment in Eastern Europe. They like joint ventures. They like private business. They like private contributions, private charities. They are even willing to have, as President Bush has suggested, some limited aid to those countries such as Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, that are making the transition.

I think where the American people draw the line is in two places: first I suspect they were as surprised as we were to have the Democratic majority leader suggest that we send aid to the Soviet Union. I do not think the American people are ready to send foreign aid to the Soviet Union, despite some Democrats. I thought that was a little bit bold.

Second, I think that most Americans do not regard the primary way of America functioning as government aid.

Madam Speaker, let me yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], and then I will come back to the Democratic side.

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I would like to congratulate him for taking out this time to talk about that very interesting speech which a number of Members have read about.

I think it is very clear that the American people do have a tremendous interest in providing assistance to those who are emerging from this totalitarianism which they have suffered from for literally decades in many cases.

I think many of us in the last several weeks and months have had the opportunity to visit Eastern Europe. One of the things I found from being over there in January, that for starters they do not have either the infrastructure or the communications network to absorb large amounts of cash.

I think that if we are going to get to a position where we are going to try to provide some kind of encouragement, it should be through innovative, creative ways, rather than simply the standard solution offered by many of our friends in this House, that of

throwing more and more money at the problem.

Let me throw out a couple of what I think to be creative ways in which we can address it. Sitting up in my office right now I have a young person called Slawek Gorecki who was nearly arrested on December 13, 1981, when as a member of the Solidarity movement he had to flee due to the fact that Soviet tanks were rolling into Warsaw.

There are now about 14 other interns or fellows who have come from Eastern Europe to the United States to learn about our form of government here. Some have argued that after 3 months of working on Capitol Hill, they may want to go back to Communist totalitarianism.

But I do believe in fact that there is going to be a clear benefit accrued to these people, as we look at a creative way to address the issue that the gentleman from Georgia addresses.

I also think that we have a number of government programs which could be utilized. One example is the Small Business Administration.

Now, I have not been a champion of the Small Business Administration in this House throughout the past decade because I have been concerned about the fact that it creates a subsidized competitive advantage over small businesses that have had to rely on the private marketplace for their sources of credit.

But I will tell you that there are a number of aspects of the Small Business Administration which could truly help those trying to emerge to this democratic form of government in Eastern Europe.

The Service Corps of Retired Executives, the SCORE program, is one example.

People whom I met with in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany said yes, they would like this kind of expertise from the United States in that area.

I think the Peace Corps is another example of an area where we could see a tremendous involvement by the United States. But the simple solution of saying that there is no leadership by the President of the United States is absolute baloney. I think that we have got to recognize he is championing, along with a number of people in this House, these kinds of recommendations.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, tomorrow it will be 1,000 days since Ronald Reagan stood at the Berlin Wall. He said several things. He said freedom itself is transforming the globe. He said, and this is the point we are trying to make about the difference between the values of the left and the rest of us in terms of how you would help Eastern Europe. He said:



In West Germany and here in Berlin, there took place an economic miracle, the *Wirtschaftswunder*. Adenauer, Erhardt, Reuter, and other leaders understood the practical importance of liberty. That just as truth can flourish only when the journalist is given freedom of speech, so prosperity can come about only when the farmer and businessman enjoy economic freedom. The German leaders reduced tariffs, expanded free trade, lowered taxes. From 1950 to 1960 alone, the standard of living in West Germany and Berlin doubled. Where four decades ago there was rubble, today in West Berlin there is the greatest industrial output of any city in Germany.

My point is when a Hungary or a Poland or an Estonia or a Latvia makes a commitment to their version of the *Wirtschaftswunder* and you have a free market, a stable currency, private property, then I think we can say they have made the transition.

But to give them aid, to suggest as the Democratic majority leader did, that we should send aid to the Soviet Union before it has made that kind of transition, I think would be very, very destructive.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I think that as this extraordinary process of the democratization of Eastern Europe unfolds, that it is inevitable that the parties will debate whose policy brought it about, and there are liable to be differences and that ultimately these differences will probably not be resolved here on the floor, but by the judgment of history.

It troubles me somewhat when I hear the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] characterizing the speech of the majority leader, that he reads the Washington Post and my friend BILL BRADLEY's comments about what DICK had to say, that nowhere is there a discussion of what in fact the majority leader did say.

I am sure the gentleman has read the majority leader's speech, and maybe the gentleman can find in the speech for me and quote to us all the specific passages where the majority leader talks about providing more aid.

The majority leader talks about proposing a food for freedom program. He talks about the lessons that President Havel, who spoke in this Chamber very eloquently, someone who has tasted very bitterly the jack boot of Soviet oppression, suggests to the Congress that we help the Soviet Union.

The majority leader, as far as I can determine from his speech, has been talking about things that are not all that different than what the President has suggested, but rather that we be more imaginative and possibly expedite the process.

If the gentleman would continue to yield, and I appreciate his indulgence, the majority leader says on this point:

I must say that President Bush has been right as far as he has gone. He has lent im-

portant political and moral support to the process of reform in the Soviet Union. I would like to enlist American farmers and business people to make more substantive investments as well. Anyone who has seen the lines outside McDonald's in Moscow knows the Soviets would appreciate American food and American goods, and American farmers and workers would appreciate the markets. We should waive trade restrictions such as Jackson-Vanik and the Stevenson amendment, relax restrictions on high tech exports, and encourage private investment in the Soviet Union. We provide Export-Import Bank loans and OPEC assistance to China. Why not the Soviet Union?

Let me end, and again thank the gentleman from Georgia for his indulgence, let me ask the gentleman if we provide this assistance to the People's Republic of China, might it not be appropriate to provide it to the Soviet Union as well? Does waiving Jackson-Vanik or repeal of the Stevenson amendment make sense to the gentleman? If it does not, I would like to hear the gentleman's reasons.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me first just say a couple things. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] made the comment that it is troublesome to talk about whose party brought us to this point. But I think this goes to the heart of why I philosophically disagree with the Democratic majority leader's speech, because it goes to the core of interpreting reality and what drives the world.

Now, my colleague from New York went to the Krasnoyarsk radar site. As I remember, the gentleman came back and reported it was not used, it was not designed to be an antiballistic missile radar.

My understanding is that the Soviet foreign minister has now said yes, it was. It was explicitly designed to be precisely what the gentleman reported it was not.

Now, what lesson has the gentleman learned about interpreting foreign policy and defense reality from the fact that apparently the Soviets were doing and have now admitted that they were doing precisely what the gentleman told the Congress they were not doing?

□ 1530

Mr. DOWNEY. Is the gentleman answering the question I put to him about the Soviet Union?

Mr. GINGRICH. We are talking about—

Mr. DOWNEY. And the waiver of Jackson-Vanik or is the gentleman simply going to answer a question by asking another?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am going to get to Jackson-Vanik, but first I am responding in sequence.

Mr. DOWNEY. Why does not the gentleman get to that, and then I will answer his question.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am responding in sequence to three or four different

things the gentleman said in his statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. I asked the gentleman a simple question.

Mr. GINGRICH. The first thing the gentleman said in his statement was it troubled him some to get involved in the debate about whose party brought the changes about. But that is at the core of this debate.

We believe that left wing values and left wing delusions about how the world works are, in fact, destructive. We are in favor of being careful and cautious because we think the world is dangerous.

This is a long-term debate that has been going on for at least 25 years in this country, almost 30 years now, and so I start by saying, and I was using a very specific example that related very directly to the Soviet Union and to foreign policy and suggesting that some of our friends in the Democratic Party wandered off to the Soviet Union, they visited a specific site, the Krasnoyarsk radar, they reported it was, in fact, not part of an antiballistic missile system. They have since been educated by the Soviets, because it was the Soviet Foreign Minister who said flatly, "Yes, we were, in fact, breaking the ABM Treaty, and we were, in fact, doing exactly what the Democrats misunderstood."

My question for the gentleman is simple. Since it is now explicitly clear that you were wrong in interpreting the Soviet Union in the 1980's, have you learned a lesson from that that makes you a little more cautious; and then I will go on and talk about Jackson-Vanik.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say one of the tragic lessons that I am learning in attempting to have a serious discussion with the gentleman is that he is not interested in a serious discussion. He is interested in almost attempting to provide ad hominem to policy matters. I am happy to talk about Krasnoyarsk, I am happy to talk about the position that the gentleman and many on the right have espoused over the years that more arms brought us more security, that totalitarian systems were incapable of change and reform, and on those matters the gentleman has been completely wrong on the values that he has espoused and the views. The gentleman wants an answer, and I will provide him an answer. The values that the gentleman has espoused and the others who are standing here is that if we built more weapons, if we forced the Soviets to their knees, inevitably they will reform. None of that has proven to be true, and in fact, it has not worked.

Mr. GINGRICH. I control the time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me finish the point. In Time magazine, the gentleman who was a Soviet agent in the British Intelligence Agency, trying to

be a double agent, who had defected to the United States, was asked a question if he had ever provided anything of use to the Soviet Union or to the West about our relationship, and he answered very interestingly. He said that he was able to explain to the West the enormous fears that the Soviet leadership had about SDI, that he believed, Brezhnev and company, that SDI was a first strike weapon, and that many of the policies and many of our relationships with the Soviet Union were being determined by what we thought to be items in our security interest but that the Soviets believed to be first strike weapons.

This level of misunderstanding has existed for some time. My interest in going to the Krasnoyarsk radar, and what I saw there, and what I said I still stand by, was my firm belief that the world is a safer place without first strike weapons, that the world would have been a much safer place, and is a safer place without the idea of a strategic defense.

Let me finish my point.

The gentleman has always maintained the view, has he not, that SDI was of enormous value, that it provided us defense, and that it was a useful bargaining tool. I have felt none of those things, and I am relieved to know today that the process of peace has been furthered by my party making sure that we did not waste billions of taxpayer dollars on a plan that would have not provided security, and would have delayed the process of any sort of understanding.

So to the extent that I played a role in Krasnoyarsk, I am happy to have played it.

Mr. GINGRICH. I control the time, and I want to come back. I want to ask the gentleman from New York one more round, and then I will talk about Jackson-Vanik, and then I will yield to the gentleman from California, and then come back to Texas.

I am absolutely fascinated, and the gentleman is sort of making my point. The Soviet Foreign Minister announces that the interpretation of the Democratic Party's liberals about the Krasnoyarsk radar is explicitly wrong, that is factually wrong, that they were doing precisely what you told us they were not doing. The gentleman's answer to that is to go off on a long summary about how glad he is we are not threatening the Soviets. I mean I just have to ask a question.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am quite happy, I am quite happy to make the point that threatening the Soviet with annihilation is not in the United States interest, nor has it been in our interest to ever threaten them with annihilation, nor they us.

Mr. GINGRICH. So the gentleman opposes deterrence? That is the essence of deterrence since 1956.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, I did not say that. What I said, and the gentleman mischaracterizes not only history but the few questions I have asked him. The gentleman is not seriously debating.

Mr. GINGRICH. I reclaim my time because I want to stay on this for a second. The essence of American deterrence policy under Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush has been to deter nuclear war by convincing the Soviets that they would be faced with, to use the gentleman's word, annihilation. That is the bipartisan foreign policy of every realistic President in both parties.

Mr. DOWNEY. With the exception of the gentleman's hero, Mr. Reagan, who decided to change that policy to one of strategic defense.

The points that I made to the gentleman, which obviously he missed, is that in our attempt to do what we felt was security for us, and has been security for us for 40 years of the postwar period, has not been interpreted by the other side as security for them, and we have in turn at some times looked at what the other side has said. Does the gentleman want an answer?

Mr. GINGRICH. Go ahead. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNEY. And we have looked at what the activities of the other side have been and said, "You see, the Soviets are doing this, they are building SS-18's, they are providing for mobility, and all of these items are indications of the Soviets' desire to launch a first strike against us," when all along the Soviets had the same sense about what we were doing.

Go ahead.

Mr. GINGRICH. No, I yield to the gentleman. Go ahead.

Mr. DOWNEY. The gentleman has said before that we are here today to talk about the majority leader's speech. The gentleman has not yet answered the point that the majority leader of the House of Representatives is talking about expanded trade. He prefers to mischaracterize what the majority leader has said and call it aid, and then in an honest attempt at dialog, talk about Krasnoyarsk. Let me answer one last time about Krasnoyarsk if I can.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], myself, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY], went there. We saw a facility that we said was a violation, if it was turned on. The Soviet Foreign Minister said it was a violation in its inception.

As far as I am concerned, that ends the debate. I was not wrong. He interpreted differently the very substance of the ABM Treaty. That is his right to do it.

Mr. GINGRICH. He, the Soviet Foreign Minister?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Shevardnaze interpreted differently. There is nothing wrong with that. That is his interpretation. There are many others.

In conversations I have had subsequently with other Soviets, there was an internal debate in the Soviet Union about that, as there is in the United States. I am delighted that after my visit to Krasnoyarsk that the Russians shut it down because of the comments we made about it and the information that we brought to light inside the Soviet Union about the nature of the radar. Not only was the trip constructive internally in the Soviet Union, but it began a debate in our country about what was in our interest.

The gentleman prefers to draw cosmic conclusions about the last 25 years of misinterpretation of history. I am sorry that he has done that. It is not my intention to debate ethereal concepts which the gentleman seems to be well rounded in, but rather the reality of the majority leader's speech, which happens to deal specifically with programs that the President has proposed that he would like to take further. I come back to that point.

Is the gentleman opposed to the waiver of Jackson-Vanik? Is the gentleman opposed to the Stevenson amendment? Is the gentleman opposed to the fact that we need to provide more in the way of investment so that democratization and market capitalism comes more quickly to the Soviet Union?

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say first of all that I find it fascinating that on a matter of fact the gentleman can suggest that he disagrees with the Soviet Foreign Minister on a topic which the Soviet Foreign Minister has stated that he was explicitly wrong about Soviet behavior on, and that he can decide now whether it was or was not correct as to what the Soviet Foreign Minister represented as fact.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is not what I said. I said the elements of the ABM Treaty are subject to interpretation.

Mr. GINGRICH. So in effect the summary is that you have learned nothing from Mr. Shevardnaze's suggestion that you were wrong in your analysis of what the Soviets were doing and what he was doing in his government?

□ 1540

It seems to me he would know whether or not they were intending in their government to violate the treaty. But let me ask—

Mr. DOWNEY. If the gentleman would like to know a little bit more about the Krasnoyarsk radar, and I do not know that there is anything else I can tell the gentleman since he seems to have made up his mind about this fact—an interesting position, I might add, for a historian—the fact is that



the Soviets in attempting to build the Krasnoyarsk radar internally were never quite aware of the political structure of how far the military had gone.

In fact, when the military decided to make the civilian portion of that government aware of the placement of the radar, it was at the same time that President Reagan made his ill-fated March 15 speech on SDI. And it was the SDI debate that propelled the Krasnoyarsk radar to the point that it ultimately was stopped after our meeting.

I would point out to the gentleman those tend to be facts. The gentleman can misinterpret them however he wants.

Mr. GINGRICH. I just want to ask a factual question because I lost the timing here. It is the American SDI debate which propelled the Russians to build Krasnoyarsk?

Mr. DOWNEY. No.

Mr. GINGRICH. And that is why—

Mr. DOWNEY. It was at the time that Soviet political people who internally wanted to oppose the radar were not in a position to do so as actively, because in our country it appeared, after the President said that he was happy, and Mr. Weinberger confirmed this, to break out of the ABM Treaty, that it was very difficult to carry that debate forward inside the Soviet Union. Those are the facts.

Let me come back to the point: Is the gentleman opposed to the waiver of Jackson-Vanik? Is the gentleman opposed to the elimination of the Stevenson amendment? It has taken us only 20 minutes to hear the gentleman's answer.

Mr. GINGRICH. I will answer that in a second, and then I will come back to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] on the SDI argument because he is an expert.

On Jackson-Vanik I would go very slowly until the Soviet Union agreed to direct flights between the Soviet Union and Israel because it is very, very important for long-term reasons to encourage the Soviet Union to open up direct flights so that the second exodus of those Jews who wish to leave the Soviet Union can go directly to Israel.

I would say to my friend from New York, would he favor that we go slowly until the Soviet Union agrees to have direct flights to Israel?

Mr. DOWNEY. No, I do not; I favor the repeal of Jackson-Vanik.

Mr. GINGRICH. Under any circumstances?

Mr. DOWNEY. And the sooner it is done the better, and I will tell you why.

Mr. GINGRICH. All right.

Mr. DOWNEY. Because I believe it is in the United States interest for the Soviet Union to move toward a market

economy. I believe that conditioning, in this instance, trade on other questions makes very little sense. I happen to believe, quite fundamentally, that putting goods on the shelves of the Soviet citizens or for the citizens of the Soviet Union is more likely to provide stability inside the Soviet Union. I do not understand why the gentleman would want to wait months, possibly years, for negotiations between other countries to determine what American foreign policy should be.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, if you remember, Jackson-Vanik was specifically a function of encouraging the Soviet Union in its relationship to its Jewish citizens.

Mr. DOWNEY. That is right; its 76,000 Jewish citizens who have left in the last year. It used to be that the gentleman used to tell us that actions speak louder than words.

Now apparently he is prepared to pin all of his hopes on words as opposed to actions. I prefer actions to words.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have to take strong issue with a number of the proposals that Mr. GEPHARDT made in the particular speech. I am looking at the Washington Post—

Mr. DOWNEY. Why does not the gentleman look at the speech? Why does not the gentleman look at the speech?

Mr. HUNTER. Let me just look at these words because the gentleman repeated these words.

Mr. DOWNEY. I have a better idea. I will make a copy of the speech.

Mr. HUNTER. I asked the gentleman to yield to me so that I can respond.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not blame the gentleman. He can read what he wants to read.

Mr. GINGRICH. We gave the gentleman from New York plenty of time. I say to the gentleman from New York, "Don't be petulant. We gave you plenty of time."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. PATTERSON). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] had yielded to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Let me quote the term used by the gentleman from New York and he can tell us if that is really part of the speech or if he was putting us on when he repeated it on the House floor.

He stated that Mr. GEPHARDT proposed sending food aid to the Soviet Union, waiving a variety of trade restrictions, including those on high-technology exports.

I have a great problem with that. I think many of the American people do.

And one particular problem with respect to the majority leader is this: A number of us opposed sending certain high technology, for example, the FSX, to Japan, an ally of the United States, for a number of reasons.

It seemed very unusual to me that the majority leader would discourage this transfer of FSX technology to an ally, and yet encourage the transfer of high-technology exports to the Soviet Union. I think that is a grave mistake. I think there is going to be a rush by Western businessmen to sell high technology to the Soviet Union, and I think it is in our interests to not allow that to happen.

Just one word about Krasnoyarsk: Apparently what the gentleman should have told us when he came back—maybe I misread his words when he came back from Krasnoyarsk—I thought he said in his opinion it was not a violation of ABM.

Mr. DOWNEY. Until it was torn down.

Mr. HUNTER. Well, let me finish my sentence, and he can answer.

Maybe what he should have said was in his opinion it was not a violation of ABM, however the Soviets might think that they are violating ABM but in his opinion they are erroneous.

I think that is a great argument for allowing the executive branch of this Government to negotiate with respect to arms control rather than Members of the House of Representatives or the other body.

Second, if you take—I think the gentleman should read the speech of his own chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN]. His leading speech, I believe, when Secretary Cheney addressed the full committee; that speech, to paraphrase, and I would hope that he gets this, Chairman ASPIN said essentially in the 1980's we did build weapons and basically build the Soviet Union into the realization that they could not win the arms race. Everybody, including Mother Teresa, basically agrees with the proposition that American strength drew the Soviet Union to the table and showed them that the military option was not a viable option and brought them to the bargaining table.

I think very clearly this debate between Mr. GINGRICH and the gentleman from New York points out the basic difference between our parties. The gentleman is a thoughtful individual, but in this case his base facts are wrong and I think that his instincts are wrong. And I think that is the basic difference between the parties.

I think if you carried the gentleman's language further, you can say

that Daniel Ortega voluntarily would have had a democratic election in Nicaragua with no pressure whatsoever from any outside group, including the other Central American governments, or without any leveraging, including the Contras. And further, he would say that if we had told the Soviet Union that the invasion, their invasion of Afghanistan, was OK, somehow there would be a debate between the military sector in the Soviet Union and the civilian leadership of the Soviet Union and if we did not complain about it they would voluntarily remove themselves from the Soviet Union.

I do not think that that line of thinking is realistic. I think that he outlined in his interchange very clearly the difference between our parties.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask a question before I yield, let me ask a question, because on page 7 of the Democratic majority leader's speech he says:

I propose a food-for-freedom program that will share the strength of America's agricultural abundance with the Eastern European and Soviet people. There is no doubt that private ownership of farmland and the hard work of our family farmers are the keys to America's success in agriculture. But while Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are moving in that direction, it is in our interest to help sustain them on that journey.

Now there are two parts to this, and I think this is precisely a suggestion of aid to the Soviet Union. First, since we already, under President Bush, sell the Soviets grain at a subsidized rate, I am presuming—and maybe we and the Washington Post and everyone else, including Senator BRADLEY, misunderstood—I am presuming that the Food-for-Freedom Program is in fact a Government aid program.

Now, do any of the three Democrats know, is the idea that the Democratic majority leader suggested of a Food-for-Freedom Program one that would take the American—

Mr. SMITH of Florida. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. It would be just as easy for us to interpret this Food-for-Freedom Program as a program that would share agricultural technology because reading that paragraph one could get the impression that we should share with the Soviets the knowledge of how our farms operate and the ways that our farmers grow so much more food per plot of land than they do. There is nothing in here which necessarily dictates the conclusion that this is a food foreign aid program, and the gentleman could postulate all he wants.

□ 1550

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH]. Then, since presumably the Democratic majority leader's press

talk with Mr. Kenworthy who says "Gephardt called for direct U.S. economic aid to the Soviet Union"—is the gentleman suggesting that the Democratic majority leader's speech is so vague as to be unknowable or that, in fact, the Washington Post explicitly miscovered it?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. The gentleman is obviously aware that the interpretation of the Washington Post article, like any other newspaper in the country, does not define the reality of a speech given by the majority leader or of the gentleman in the well.

Now, it is very obvious that there is economic capability in this country to help the Soviets along the journey toward democratization, which is what the majority leader is talking about. We have in the past, going back just in recent history, 1948 and the Marshall plan, we had an economic package for our vanquished enemies, not an enemy, which we did not engage in war, but a vanquished enemy—set of enemies. That was done not only to rebuild those countries for humanitarian purposes, as the gentleman, as a historian, understands this very well, I believe, but done to expand the economic capability of the United States, because for 40 years or more thereafter we had developed a market in which we sold the bulk of the goods produced by this country.

What we made was an investment for the United States and the future of those countries, in order to be able to employ Americans, to build American plants, to build American products, to sell in those countries.

After all, the gentleman is aware, what did we do? Japan didn't buy much from the United States for 20 years, the Far East did not buy much for 20 years. In reality, this is what we are talking about. This is a market of 300 million or more people.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am all for the market.

Before I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] let me ask this for a second: We have at least four Democrats on the floor now, and I am sure others are watching. It would be helpful if a Member were to find out, in the next 20 minutes during the time I have left, if the Food-for-Freedom Program is simply the sale of food and technology. In this case, frankly, President Bush is already doing it. Or if, in fact, it was as the Washington Post seemed to think, a proposal for "direct U.S. economic aid to the Soviet Union." If one of our Democrat friends wants to call about that.

Mr. TORRICELLI. If the gentleman will yield, I think that the best way to settle the interpretation of the speech is perhaps to point out that the gentleman is suffering from the same failure of, indeed, the administration; that in looking at the opportunities

and problems, today, in relation with the Soviet Union, he is very much looking at the trees and not the larger forest.

Is Mr. GEPHARDT talking about food aid that would involve a degree of subsidy? Is it credit, is it loans? That is not, Mr. GINGRICH, the principal issue. The issue that Mr. GEPHARDT is bringing to light is this: That the balance of power in the Soviet Union, whether she returns to being the threat of recent years or whether there, indeed, is a chance for real and lasting reform, is in the balance. Mr. GEPHARDT's point is simply this: That reform needs to be rewarded; that the people of the Soviet Union should recognize that the degree to which—is the gentleman interested in my answer? Is there a chance here for a genuine dialog? I would like to have a dialog.

Mr. DREIER of California. I would say that this is the most genuine dialog going on in quite a while.

Mr. GINGRICH. Go ahead.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. GEPHARDT's point is that the electorate of the Soviet Union should recognize to the degree and the extent that there is reform, that the quality of life in the Soviet Union is changing, and to the degree that the demands of the United States are being met, the quality of life of the Soviet Union is rising.

Mr. GEPHARDT has recognized, as presumably the Bush administration has not, that we do not have endless time here. If 6 months, or a year, or 2 years passes and the quality of the Soviet life further deteriorates, despite political change, then we have no reason to believe that this reform is going to be endless. That is the point Mr. GEPHARDT has addressed, and that is what I think Members should address themselves to.

Mr. GINGRICH. I want to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but my question is, in order to facilitate change the gentleman just described, is the gentleman in favor of giving foreign aid to the Soviet Union?

Mr. TORRICELLI. I do not believe that Mr. GEPHARDT envisions, nor would I, that the American taxpayer subsidize foreign aid to the Soviet Union, but rather—

Mr. GINGRICH. What is he talking about?

Mr. TORRICELLI. Let me answer the question. This return to the point that was so eloquently, I believe to be fair, distorted by the gentleman from California. What we have talked about and said is like all of our NATO allies, indeed, like most or half of the Bush administration, allowing technology sales like aircraft technology sales, as the gentleman pointed out. He knows no one intends that, but rather like our allies. To allow instead a kind of OPEC guarantee.



Mr. SMITH of Florida. Before the gentleman yields, I would like to speak.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is fascinating that the largest point evidently made by the majority leader is that the President lacks leadership. Now we find the leadership being provided by the majority leader in a speech so vague that no one understands what he meant, and that everybody who stands up has their own interpretation of the speech, a speech that is supposedly providing leadership.

I suppose the next thing we will find out is that when he talked of exporting high technology, what he meant was Nintendo games, and he did not really mean anything of substance. If this is not as it was interpreted by the stories in the newspapers, I did not hear the majority leader repudiate the newspapers who interpreted his remarks as intending U.S. taxpayer aid to the Soviet Union; but now I hear a series of Democrats come to the floor to all of a sudden have an interpretation which is different.

This speech, then, is so vague that anything that any person wants to say it said, it says.

Mr. GINGRICH. Give me 30 seconds.

First of all, apparently earlier today, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EARLY], a Democrat, also misunderstood the majority leader because he asked Secretary Baker if the administration was going to propose aid to the Soviet Union, and Secretary Baker said, No. 1, the majority leader made the statement; No. 2, the Soviets have not asked for aid; and No. 3, the administration does not plan to.

I yield briefly to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HUNTER. Let me answer the gentleman who said I distorted the majority leader's statement, implying high technology could include high technologies like aerospace, and it possibly meant something else.

I am not for giving high technology to the Soviet Union, who in the past have used high technology which was to be used in the private sector like technology that was to be used on bearings that are now used on nuclear systems aimed at the United States, under the guise of domestic applied technology, and applied to the military sector. The military sector in the strategic area of the Soviet Union is going full bore. The R&D is full bore. I think it is fair to the gentleman from Georgia to ask the question, "Do you agree with the idea of selling high technology to the Soviet Union?"

Mr. TORRICELLI. Would the gentleman pose the question to me? The gentleman raised a question.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I pose a question, because this is an interesting kind of debate. Does the gentleman believe that the Bush program for selling subsidized wheat to the Soviet Union is not an economic benefit program?

Mr. GINGRICH. It is a benefit program.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Why is the gentleman spending all of this time attempting to beat over the head of the majority leader for proposing what may be as innocuous a program as subsidized grain sale?

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me explain. We have here, and I do have the speech. I read it yesterday afternoon, and was amazed by it. We have 10 pages of a call for a bold visionary, dynamic, risk-taking, opening for the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe.

Now it turns out, now that we are beginning to understand, that maybe your leader was talking about a little more grain than Bush is already selling, a little more technology than Bush is selling.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. The gentleman is engaging in the politics of pettiness.

May I point out to the gentleman that there is a great deal more in that speech than the one called for in the Food for Freedom Program, and there is more in it than high technology. There is a significant overall approach, including significantly more than cultural exchanges, student exchanges, exchanges of agriculture technology. There is a much broader range.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me read another example of why some Members are confused. Proposing on page 8:

A union of nations for international trade and economic development [UNITED] might be a means for giving structure to such cooperation. UNITED would bring together on a regular basis the leaders of the major trading democracies—the nations of the European Community—

Mr. SMITH of Florida. That is not the Soviet Union.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me finish my point, because I will have a different question than the one we are planning for the members of the nations. "European Community, the United States, Canada, Japan, and Australia."

Madam Speaker, he then goes on with this sentence, which I for the life of me cannot understand, because I do not understand what he is talking about; I do not understand how his English works here. This is on page 9:

UNITED would not be a new bureaucracy but rather a new approach.

Then, having watched Brussels, for example, and the European Common Market, I would ask a question. Now,

his term is "giving structure to such cooperation."

By definition, UNITED is going to end up hiring at least hundreds and maybe thousands of people. They will be called civil servants by those who love them and bureaucrats by those who hate them. I would ask, what is he talking about?

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, is the gentleman just raising questions, or are we going to be able to answer them?

Mr. GINGRICH. I have yielded almost half my time. Go ahead. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, the point the gentleman is making is a point that many people in this country and in Western European nations, allied NATO countries, have raised since the very, very unique and significant events in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. What will be the future of NATO, and what will be our reference point vis-a-vis NATO when Europe 1992 comes into play?

Many of us believe that there is a significant role for NATO to play but in a changed structure.

Mr. GINGRICH. Sure.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. This is what the majority leader is talking about. You may not need to hire a whole new bureaucracy.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me make my point. We are not somehow using the same language. I do not object to this concept.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I think we are using the same language.

Mr. GINGRICH. Wait. I do not object to the concept of UNITED. UNITED may be a wonderful idea. I might even vote for it. But when a politician says to us, having defined a multinational group as a structure, that it will not be a new bureaucracy, I would ask, what will it be? Will it be a large koala bear, or will it be nine kangaroos?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Oh, come on. The gentleman is really not doing justice to his own argument.

Mr. GINGRICH. Of course it will be a bureaucracy, but it may be a useful bureaucracy.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. But it may change an existing bureaucracy into one that will meet the test of what is necessary for the 1990's and beyond.

Mr. GINGRICH. Or it may be an old bureaucracy transformed.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Perhaps it will be.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I do not understand the speech. Listen, I sympathize

with the majority leader's problems. Sometimes when one leaps to boldness, one may land in the Bay of Pigs, or just in more confusion.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, I want to only make several comments to my colleagues. That is all I want to do because, frankly, I believe given the extraordinary times in which we live, the intellectual level of this analysis does not do the House justice. We have the gentleman from California who believes that we are wrong because some are advocating changes in the sale of technology to Eastern European states, that we are selling out aerospace secrets, despite the fact that the State Department, the Commerce Department, and all our NATO Allies have the same view. And the gentleman in the well believes that somehow we are socializing international trade and creating a bureaucracy because the majority leader believes, as I believe and as any economic analyst would believe today, that there is a need to coordinate international trade and investment policies.

So it is no wonder that the Bush administration is failing to either be visionary or bold, indeed even to propose any advances or new policies in the wake of these dramatic developments. His hands and his feet are hog-tied to the right wing of his own party that fails to see beyond the horizon.

Let me suggest finally to the gentleman from Georgia how deeply offended I am that at this time of victory in the cold war that indeed anyone would come to the well of this House and claim that the victory of the cold war and the collapse of communism, this triumph in this moment of American history, is due to any extreme ideology of the United States, any political party, or any partisan leadership. This is a moment when after 40 years of American history we have come to triumph.

My party does not need to be lectured about what was required to win the cold war. We have been here from the birth of NATO to drawing the line in Korea, to leadership in Vietnam, to drawing the line in Afghanistan, to increasing military spending to reverse the decline of the 1950's and to reverse it again in the last year of the Carter administration.

My party does not need any lectures about winning the cold war. We were there when the line was drawn, and we have been here to pass the biggest defense budgets in history when it came to victory.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, let me reclaim my time.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker, I believe our American soliders who

died and our taxpayers would be offended by the gentleman's argument.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, Let me reclaim my time.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam Speaker—

Mr. GINGRICH. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. PATTERSON). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] controls the time.

Mr. GINGRICH. This is not the Senate, and the gentleman cannot filibuster.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, the fact is, I say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that when your leader attacks the President personally, when your leader talks over and over about timidity and lack of vision, it is a little much for you to come to the floor and suggest that somehow it is inappropriate for us to talk about personalities.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. This is not an attack personally—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia controls the time.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, let me yield first to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Before I go ahead with my point, I would like to say that as soon as this special order is completed, I am going to be addressing an issue on which every one of us agree, and that is memorializing Jose Napoleon Duarte, who has not been mentioned on the floor of this House since he passed away. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations will join us in that.

Since we are analyzing the speech of the majority leader, I would like to briefly point to the State of the Union Message which was just handed to me. There has been this misperception that it seems that our part and our President want to do absolutely nothing to address the concerns of these emerging democracies and the Soviet Union.

I went through a litany just a few minutes ago of creative ways in which I believe we can address them. Many of them were echoed by my friend, the gentleman from Florida. But let me just quote, since we are focusing for this entire time on the speech of the majority leader, the words of the President of the United States in his State of the Union Message. He said this:

It is time to offer our hand to the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe so that continent, for too long a continent divided, can see a future whole and free.

He went on to say this:

We are in a period of great transition, great hope, and with great uncertainty. We recognize that the Soviet threat in Europe is diminishing, but we see little change in Soviet strategic modernization.

That issue alone gets right to the question of technology transfer which my friend, the gentleman from San Diego, mentioned, and I think nearly all of us are recognizing the fact that we are seeing a dramatic increase in intelligence operations in both the Soviet Union and in the United States. And I think in light of that, for us to move in the direction of massive technology transfer, which has been discussed very clearly by our friend, the gentleman from San Diego, CA, is unwise, for in the Soviet Union their goal is first for defense and then for commercial use, as opposed to the way it is in the United States. I think we have got to be very vigilant in addressing that subject.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, let me just put one thing in the RECORD.

Tomorrow will be 1,000 days since Ronald Reagan stood in front of the Berlin Wall. He said at that time:

Are these the beginning of profound changes in the Soviet State, or are they token gestures intended to raise false hopes in the West or to strengthen the Soviet system without changing it? We welcome change and openness, for we believe freedom and security go together, and the advance of human liberty can only strengthen the cause of world peace. There is one sign the Soviets can make that will advance dramatically the cause of freedom and peace. General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, if you seek the prosperity of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization, come here to this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, tear down that wall.

That was 1,000 days ago tomorrow.

My point is simple, and I know that my friends on the left do not like to hear it. The fact is that under George Bush, whether it is Panama or Nicaragua, whether it is Berlin, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and the rest of the Soviet Empire, we have been making remarkable progress. We have not done it the way they would like to do it; we have not done it the way they would like to give us credit for. But the fact is that Secretary Baker and Secretary Cheney and President Bush have been working very systematically to create an environment in which in fact we have had a far greater chance to create democracy and free markets.

Madam Speaker, I simply would close by saying to my colleagues in the Democratic Party: "If you think I exaggerate about the majority's personal assault on the President, read pages 3 and 4 of his speech. Read the kind of language that is in there, because to me it does seem to be inappropriate."



□ 1610

# IN DEFENSE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER'S SPEECH

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mrs. PATTERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I am, frankly, not quite sure where to start because, when I took the time for this special order, I had assumed that I would have time for an orderly, rational, nonrabid discussion of foreign and economic policy.

Madam Speaker, I happen to have been present when the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], gave the speech which has been often referred to and often misinterpreted on the floor today, and I have to tell my colleagues that I think it is one of the best speeches I have ever heard. I think that the majority leader in a very statesmanlike way tried to lay out for the country what our policy would look like if we were not sleepwalking our way through the most dramatic changes that have occurred in the world in the last generation and a half.

In addition, Madam Speaker, I would suggest that the very modest proposals which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the majority leader, laid out yesterday in fact probably do not even go as far as this country will wind up going in the next 10 years.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I will be happy to yield when I finish. I will not yield now. The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has had an hour. I am going to take my time to say what I want, and not until I finish will I yield to him, and I ask the Speaker to—

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I would like to know if it is worthwhile staying here.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I will not yield for any purpose until I am finished.

Mr. HUNTER. I think that is clear.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] has had his time. I am going to have mine.

Now, as I was saying, one of the techniques of our friends on the radical right, as anyone who had ever shared a television show with them knows, is to have constant interruptions so that we cannot make our point. It is called politics. I call it something else. However, Madam Speaker, I am not going to be disturbed by it today.

The fact is that I think, if we are serious about providing true help to emerging democracies throughout the

world and if we are serious about promoting economic reform and political reform in the Soviet Union, we will not listen to the voices we have heard here for the past hour. We will instead listen to voices such as Mr. Havel, the new President of Czechoslovakia, who suggested that before we can create a new world that we first have to discard old habits, and he suggested that, if we want to help Eastern Europe, the most important thing for us to do is to help move along the process of political and economic reform in the Soviet Union. Madam Speaker, I fully subscribe to that view.

Now the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] engaged in a spirited critique of the Bush administration's response to the events in Eastern Europe and other places around the world, and he suggested that it was rather tepid, to say the least. I agree with that judgment.

However, Madam Speaker, what distinguishes the comments of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] yesterday from the comments we have heard here today is that Mr. GEPHARDT chose to elevate the debate rather than to, in my judgment, debase it, as all too many voices all too frequently do on this floor, and I think that, when one engages in that kind of a discussion, when one chooses to engage in rather quick attacks on the commitment of a person with whom one disagrees, I think that in the process of doing that you say more about yourself than you say about the other fellow.

So, Madam Speaker, I am willing to let people be the judge of the comments we have heard for the last hour, and I would like, if I can, to try to elevate the discussion a bit again and talk about what I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] was trying to say yesterday and what he did say very well.

To do that, Madam Speaker, I think I ought to refer to what I understand were the opening comments in the previous hour when it was suggested that somehow the Democratic policies of the last 25 years were policies of weakness. Well, let me suggest that I come from the State of Wisconsin, and we used to have a Senator there by the name of Joe McCarthy. Joe McCarthy used somewhat different words. He used to call it 20 years of treason. That was just as much nonsense then as the comments about Democratic weakness represents nonsense to me today in my view.

I would like to just for a moment repeat for the benefit of anyone here the history of the Democratic policies with respect to the rest of the world. In my view we are celebrating the greatest change in world events, the greatest lurch toward freedom that we have had in the life of anybody in this room, and we are celebrating this

today because of the policies instituted by a Democratic President, Harry Truman, who is now much revered by a gentleman on that side of the aisle even though they vilified him when he was in office. We had policies put in place by Harry Truman which began the 45-year sustained policies that resulted in the openings for freedom that we see today, and those policies were followed and enlarged upon on a bipartisan basis by Republican and Democratic Presidents for the last generation—more than a generation.

If my colleagues take a look at what Harry Truman proposed, what I find interesting is that our friends on the radical right will make a bow to Harry Truman now and then, even as they savaged the very policies that he stood for. Harry Truman, for instance, began the Marshall plan. Can my colleagues see what would happen on that side of the aisle today if we had a President propose an initiative as large as the Marshall plan? There would be blood all over this floor from people crying about that from here to the nearest television camera. It was Harry Truman who proposed the framework of NATO and got this country to accept it and the generation-long, extraordinary sacrifice that that required of the American people. It was Harry Truman who saw to it that we put together the treaty with Japan which built Japan as a democracy because they had never known it, and it sent them on the way toward being a participant in the world order, in a stable world order, a tremendous achievement.

It was Harry Truman, I would point out to the gentlemen who just spoke, who suggested that the Soviet Union ought to be a member of the international financial institutions, and in fact Harry Truman, for those who have any memory, proposed that the United States even offer assistance to the Soviet Union so that we could together march down the road to a new world order. It was Joe Stalin who was afraid of American ideas, who was afraid of the penetration of western capital behind the Iron Curtain. It was Joe Stalin who stopped it. That was who it was.

What the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is suggesting in his speech is that we pick up in a very modest way the suggestion that Harry Truman made when he was trying to put the world together rather than tear the country apart. That is what Harry Truman was recommending, and, if the gentlemen are going to co-opt Harry Truman as one of their heroes, then why do they not swallow him all the way?

Madam Speaker, I would also point out that after Harry Truman came Jack Kennedy. Indeed Jack Kennedy made a mistake. He had the Bay of

Pigs. However, unlike many other politicians I know, Jack Kennedy was man enough to admit his mistake, man enough to admit his errors, and he learned from them, unlike an awful lot of politicians I know.

□ 1620

He put together a little operation called the Cuban Missile Crisis, which led to the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba without a shot being fired, not a bad week's work.

It was also Jack Kennedy who produced the partial test ban treaty, who tried to protect the world from the dangers of routine nuclear radiation around the world. That is a tremendous achievement.

Or if you want to take the Middle East, we have the much maligned Jimmy Carter, who I think in the years after his Presidency has demonstrated that he, better than any other occupant, knows how to bring honor to the office by continuing to do service, rather than using the prestige of the Presidency to see how much dough he can rake in, whether it is from Japan or anybody else with a willing checkbook. When you take a look at what President Carter produced, President Carter was the fellow who happened to produce the only major progress in the last 15 years in the Middle East. It was President Carter who personally negotiated the Camp David Agreement which saw to it that you could never have or that you would not have a repetition of war in the Middle East, because he made peace between Egypt and Israel. That was crucial, and that is what this administration is now trying to build upon and I congratulate them for it.

If you want to talk about weakness, what do you think of a policy that leaves 250 marines in Lebanon like sitting ducks where they could not leave and they could not shoot and they wound up getting wiped out by a terrorist attack? That did not happen under a Democratic President. That happened under a different kind of a President. I do not blame President Reagan for that, because anybody can make policy judgments that lead to bad conclusions, but the fact is that that was a serious mistake, and as far as I recall that did not happen on the Democratic watch.

It also was not a Democratic President who engaged in the under-the-table arms sales to Mr. Khomeini. That was a fellow by the name of Reagan, at least it was an administration called Reagan, that engaged in that kind of conduct.

So if we are going to start shooting at each other over past mistakes, we have plenty of bullets in our gun, too, fellows. It seems to me that not very much is serving by doing that.

What the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] was trying to do was

simply to point out that there were a lot of things that were being neglected in the Bush administration's pursuit of policy with respect to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

I would also point out, for instance, that one of the previous Republican speakers made much ado about the fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] was talking about some assistance to the U.S.S.R. Well, I have a fiscal 1990 economic and military assistance chart here and if you look down the list of countries receiving aid, do you know what I find? The U.S.S.R., the Soviet Union, 5 million bucks. Now, they got that money because the leading Republican in the United States Senate, a fine Senator, suggested that we ought to provide \$5 million in assistance to the Soviet Union to respond to the damage in Armenia because of the earthquake.

The thrust of the speech of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] yesterday was simply that if we can provide some minimal assistance to the Soviet Union because of a physical earthquake, that we ought to be able to do a little bit better than we are doing in providing assistance to Eastern Europe and providing assistance to those forces in the Soviet Union who are trying to bring about the largest political earthquake in our lifetime. I would suggest that if we do not do that, we are a little bit silly and a little bit blind.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Speaker, first of all, I want to congratulate the gentleman particularly on the lucid statement he has made. I do not come here very often, and I was distressed at the type of debate that I think the gentleman has accurately characterized that we had in the previous hour. It was not a desire to seek the truth. It was a desire, rather, to make political points, to divide as opposed to bring together people of reason on the question of what should our foreign and economic policy be.

Much was made of the majority leader's point about foreign aid, and in particular the food for progress provision. If the gentleman will indulge me for a minute, I just want to make sure for those who are still listening that there is some understanding, since the gentleman from Wisconsin has suggested that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has added a new wrinkle to the debate, but it is not a bold proposal. It is not the Marshall plan of Harry Truman. The Food for Progress provision that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] seeks to expand to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union was included in the 1985 Farm Act by the Reagan administration, and under this plan the President

can give food and aid to any country that he declares is reforming its agricultural policies in the direction of private enterprise, free markets for distribution and economic freedom. The reforms do not have to be already adopted, but the country does have to be committed to the process.

So the rhetorical question was asked, and never answered, "Well, you know, you are for another big foreign aid program." As the gentleman knows, there is no finer authority in the House than the gentleman in the well, that we do not have the money to give, but we do have the expertise to lend. There are certain things that we can do, and this particular foreign aid process was conditioned on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe doing things that are in their interest and things we want them to do to begin with.

Let me make just one last point, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding further. In a way, this is a debate about two visions of reality, the vision that suggests that they have learned nothing from history, that somehow the Soviet Union continues to be an evil empire, or an evil empire that is the process of reform, but that we should play no process in that reform. As Mr. Havel said to us when he was here, that would be a mistake, that it is in the interest of Eastern Europe furthering the process of democratization there, and in the interest of the United States to push the Soviet Union further and faster.

I often hear people say, "Well, you know, we could be wrong here. I mean, Gorbachev, something could happen, someone can replace Gorbachev. We could have a right wing alternative. We need to stand ready." No one is suggesting that we should not stand ready, but why would we want to do anything that would encourage a more bellicose Soviet leader? Why would it not be in the interest of the United States to see Gorbachev succeed, to see food on the tables and on the shelves in Moscow, business opportunities for American and Soviet citizens alike.

The gentleman talked about earthquakes. He correctly pointed out two of them, one where we saw the greatest capacity of American generosity to respond when they had the earthquake in Armenia. Now as the gentleman has pointed out, there is an earthquake of epic proportions.

I would only say I would like to live in a era where we look back at the 1990's and the twilight years of the 20th century and say that we lived in the age of Gorbachev and Bush, where there was finally a recognition that the world had changed, that the threat of force, that the use of force was unacceptable as a means of dispute resolution.



What the majority leader is saying that if we do not change quickly, if we do not recognize our responsibilities, the American role will be a footnote to history, not a chapter, not a page. It seems to me he has done us an enormous service by making the speech and getting us thinking.

Unhappily in the last hour we engaged in a polemic exercise that did not quite border on name calling, but was a very unnutritious fare to those people who want something more to eat, and I thank the gentleman for offering us a meal and not a very cold snack.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I know it is unusual to expect that we will hear thoughtful statements on special orders. I am happy to see that the gentleman has provided one.

Mr. MOODY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOODY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I wanted to make several points. I was not here for the earlier part of the hour with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], but I think the gentleman from Georgia truly insulted and deeply offended me from what I did hear by attempting once again to label the loyal opposition to the Bush administration, the congressional Democrats, as disloyal. The gentleman has made this a practice of his trade, and I personally was deeply offended.

Since the Joseph McCarthy days, certain parties in the Republican Party have tried to gain public advantage by impugning the loyalty of the Democrats. As I think the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] pointed out, it was the Democrats who were the architects of the whole policy of containment that started the cold war to contain the Soviet threat from Truman on through Kennedy and others.

For the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] to try to characterize the Democratic Party as somehow weak on communism does a disservice to this House. I call it political pollution, and I found it deeply insulting.

It was not the Democratic administration but it was the Republican administration that shipped arms to Khomeini. It was the Republican administration that supported subsidizing grain sales to the Soviet Union, and money is fungible, so that releases money for other purposes. It was the Reagan administration that supported shipping arms to China, low-grade military technology though it was, but it was still military technology.

I want to just add one final word on the question of Krasnoyarsk, since I was there, and since the report that we produced was so distorted in its

characterization by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

We pointed out that there were three purposes to which that facility could be put. Two of them were illegal. If it was a battle management station, we pointed out that would be in violation of the ABM Treaty. If it was an early warning system, that would be a violation, since it was not on the periphery. However, if it was a space tracking system, it would not be illegal. That is a loophole, and that continues to be a loophole, in the ABM Treaty. That is not a violation. It was not possible for us, visiting it, to tell which of those three purposes it would be put to in the future, since the electronic gear that would be necessary to make that decision was not yet installed. All we pointed out was that if it were of the first two, it would be illegal, and the third it would not. We could not now tell, and that is what we stressed. We could not read the minds of the Soviet officials.

We could not know that they were actually intending. We could only look at the physical evidence that was available to us. We made that very plain.

For the Soviets now to later come out and say, "We all along intended it to be a violation," fine, I am glad they came clean, but that is not inconsistent with our report. We could not read their minds.

We said that if it was of the two of the three systems, it would be illegal, but the loophole existed in the treaty that would not make it illegal if they, in fact, went to a space tracking system.

My own view, from talking to Soviet officials, is that they decided to gain the maximum political mileage out of it by saying, "OK, it was a violation." That is all the more reason why we have to reaffirm support for the ABM Treaty.

They used this as a way, in their own self-interest, to lock us in on an ABM Treaty by locking themselves in on an ABM Treaty. I see their point of view.

Our report is not a case of being misled. It was a case of laying out the physical facts as we saw them.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Speaker, let me just edify the gentleman and the Chamber on this one other point, and any people who may be listening and interested in this somewhat obscure but still important matter, when I asked Soviet officials after Shevardnadze made this point, I asked them why did he decide to say what he did and how he said it. The answer came back to me that, of course, there was ambiguity about the radar, but that Shevardnadze was anxious to sock it

to the Soviet military, and that there is still ambiguity, as the gentleman pointed out, in the ABM Treaty.

Our friends on the far right see cosmic significance in the fact that we came there and came back from there and made certain comments, and that the Soviet Foreign Secretary made other comments.

What I find most amazing is their willingness to vest in the Soviet Foreign Secretary, someone for whom they have historically not placed any credence, the fact that now we see the final word.

Mr. MOODY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MOODY. Madam Speaker, I think it is they who are being duped by allowing the Soviets to make self-serving statements as they did, that they suddenly believed the self-serving statements when they do not believe our report which said it could be any one of three options, and the Soviets would be in violation of the exercise of the first two. So this is the report.

It would be well for the minority whip to actually read the board report before he characterizes it so mistakenly as he did on the floor of the House.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY. Madam Speaker, the Soviets, after we left and we talked about the terrible way the station was built, internally after our visit, were embarrassed by what we said about the station, and decided not to continue work on the radar station, and have ultimately decided to not go ahead with that.

It seems to me that in the broad sweep of history as opposed to its pop interpretation, which it is heir to by the right these days, I think our visit would stand the test of time as having not only been constructive in furthering the debate, but by moving the process on ahead, and that it has been constructive to both sides.

Mr. MOODY. If the gentleman will yield further, it stimulated a debate inside the Soviet Union which has led to the final agreement to tear it down. Our visit also pointed out that there is a loophole in the ABM Treaty which someday should be plugged.

Mr. SCHEUER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I congratulate him for bringing a breath of fresh air into this whole debate on foreign aid. I served with him not on the Committee on Appropriations where he leads the distinguished subcommittee on foreign aid,

but on the Joint Economic Committee, and the gentleman from Wisconsin is surely one of the most brilliant economic minds and thoughtful economic analysts. I congratulate him on the sanity he has shown and also on a bit of compassion, too.

Our House can afford to be both of those things.

I came over here as I observed that really unedifying, degrading, demeaning repartee centered around our colleague from Georgia. That was not this House at our best. I was not proud to be a Member of this House during those minutes that the minority whip held forth.

So I want to congratulate the gentleman from some facts and also for some heart, and I think we should stand for both of those.

I want to just make two points relevant to his analysis of what the foreign aid potential is now. First, right after World War II, at the time of the Marshall Plan, we were contributing 3.2 percent of our GNP for foreign aid. Today we contribute 0.3 percent, less than one-tenth of that. That is a decision of our own making. That is a decision of the executive branch.

The fact is we have a \$5 trillion economy, and we can do with it as we will. If we decide we are not going to spend it here in foreign aid, then there is the whole question of alternatives.

The Joint Economic Committee heard testimony from Herb Stein, a conservative Republican economist who was President Nixon's Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and he testified to us we can do what we want to do with \$5 trillion economy. Nobody is limiting us but ourselves. So we can do far better, a multiple, many multiples of what we are doing now. The second point, there seems to be an emerging consensus which has escaped this administration that we really can crank down the military apparatus very substantially. One of the first evidence that we have had from military professionals was former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who testified a number of months ago that he thought that we could reduce the military budget by half over a 10-year period, by the end of the decade of the 1990's.

Then in the last week we have seen Mr. William Webster, head of our CIA, say that the Soviet Union has really progressed away from an offensive posture toward a defensive posture, and that in Mr. Webster's opinion, and I think I am quoting him accurately, it is highly unlikely at this time that that is reversible; even if Mr. Gorbachev were to be replaced, that irreversible trends have been set in motion in the Soviet Union.

The Secretary of Defense, a former colleague of ours in this House, Mr. Cheney, took great umbrage at Mr. Webster's testimony, and he said it un-

dermined the credibility of Mr. Cheney and President Bush, as, indeed, it did. He implied that Mr. Webster was not being a loyal member of the team by 'fessing up' and giving America his honest appraisal of whether we could afford to commence a significant winding down of our military budget.

□ 1640

I think that is degrading. I think Mr. Webster has an obligation to provide the President and the Secretary of Defense and the American people with his best judgment, and he did that. He said these forces seem virtually irreversible, and we can probably count on that, if we keep our powder dry.

Now, just today Gen. Andrew Goodpaster, who has been deeply involved in strategic planning for over a generation, testified before a luncheon of members of the House and Senate that he thinks we can, and I will use his phrase, "We can put our military budget on a downward glide," on a downward glide, "and that over the next five years we can cut our military budget in half." In other words, he shrank the timeframe that Secretary McNamara suggested by half.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, if I may reclaim my time, does the gentleman think he might be described as being weak or soft on communism?

Mr. SCHEUER. I would think not. He is a highly thoughtful, highly intellectual member of the armed services, a leader of the armed services over a period of a generation.

Mr. OBEY. Is the gentleman suggesting that the only people who might be attacked by some Members of this aisle for being "soft on Communists" would be people who happen to be Democratic politicians?

Mr. SCHEUER. Well, there is a great deal of evidence to justify that. What I am trying to suggest is tough security-minded professionals have testified that we can make deep and lasting cuts in our defense budget. Mr. McNamara suggested cutting it by half over a decade. Mr. Webster fortified that position, that he thinks the changes are virtually irreversible in the Soviet Union. Today, an hour ago, General Goodpaster said we can cut it by half in 5 years.

I think that should give the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] heart, and give all Members heart, that we can produce a significant peace dividend and we can do it reasonably quickly, without jeopardizing American security.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] for his contribution. I think that brings us back again to something that Majority Leader GEPHARDT said in his speech yesterday, because what was selectively left out in some of the comments we heard today was the fact

that the majority leader indicated we did not necessarily have to spend large amounts or larger amounts of foreign assistance. The gentleman said what we did have to do was spend our foreign aid smarter.

I would simply point out that I do not think it is an especially alert or appropriate reaction to the changes we have seen in the world when the administration sends us a foreign aid bill which after the collapse of the Soviet empire and the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, suggests that our principal response to that in the aid area ought to be to increase military aid by \$370 million over last year, and to take the last remaining military loans which we provide on a loan basis and simply say okay, in one last swoosh of generosity, we are going to convert these last remaining \$400 million in loans to grants.

That means that in the teeth of everything that has happened in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, the administration's response is to greatly increase the purchasing power for military aid rather than economic aid. It seems to me that that is a flat Earth approach to what is happening in the world.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly appreciate his taking this time out so we can discuss this issue on a rational basis, which unfortunately was not particularly available during the last hour of debate.

The interesting thing about this administration is its varied approach to the answers that we have all been searching for in terms of the changed realities.

While the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has just documented and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] just documented these significant statements by members of the administration and members of previous administrations, both Republican and Democratic, with reference to how they see the military spending aspect, we are now faced with a unique situation made by the White House.

Mr. Darman is now proposing for the President, and, of course, it is the ultimate priority of the President to do, he is on his own, a reprogramming of dollars in order to save military personnel that would have to be cut under the Gramm-Rudman proposal from the sequestration which went into effect.

When sequestration started the President could have exempted these personnel from those cuts, but he chose not to do that. Now, in the face of a significantly diminished threat, in



the face of his own calculations that we can reduce our troops in NATO, in Western European nations, down to 220,000 from the almost 300,000 level we have, he is now trying to utilize money which should have been cut before for other programs to put onto personnel, to save that cost structure. Not to save money, but to save the cost structure of the DOD. So that nobody can look and say, "This money can be saved," he wants to perpetuate the higher numbers wherever he can justify the spending of those military dollars, this in the face of an enormously diminished threat from the East, as documented by almost everyone that has any knowledge of the circumstances.

They refuse to move away from this previous set of circumstances. It is interesting because it is a traditional Reagan view. It is a traditional conservative view that somehow yesterday was better than today, when the reality is today is so much better than yesterday, and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] indicated when he started his hour, if we play our cards right and if we lead, not follow, and if we shape the future, not only react to it, we can make tomorrow even better than the possibilities that loom large today. But somehow the administration and the President are failing to do that.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, let me simply say that I think the gentleman's comments again bring us back to the speech of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], because one thing that the gentleman from Missouri said yesterday was this. He said:

America must once again assert itself as a leader. To do that we must change the way we think about national strength and arm ourselves for the economic competition already underway. America must begin by helping to shape the change in Europe or we will surely be a victim of it. To that end there is much that we can do right away.

I think what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] was trying to point out is that if we really want an America which is strong enough to lead the world in the nineties and the remainder of this century and into the 21st century, we had better make some very large changes.

We have heard people talk about a Japanese decade. Now with the events in Europe, with the emerging of the European trade community in Europe, 1992, we hear talk now about a European decade and a European century.

It seems to me we would like to have the decade of the nineties be an American decade. We would like to have America enter the 21st century still in a position to lead the world through both example and through economic and political and military strength.

I think what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] was trying to point out is best reflected on this

chart. The Bush administration response to the changes in the world has been to come to the Congress and say:

You know what we need more than anything, boys and girls? We need another \$5 billion in military spending.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. If the gentleman would yield, they have said they are cutting military spending. Would the gentleman explain how they are in fact increasing military spending?

Mr. OBEY. The fact is they are cutting from their wish level that they expected to have next year. They are not cutting from the existing spending level.

I want to get back to the investment portion of the budget. If we want to be in a strong position, and with all due respect I do not need any lectures on the strength of our defense, of our own values, from anyone who thinks that it is appropriate for the Bush administration to support the renewal of contacts with and the renewal of aid to China after the slaughter in Tiananmen Square.

□ 1650

With all due respect, I need no lectures from people about commitment to our values and the projection of our values in the teeth of that kind of policy aberration.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. OBEY. Sure, I will yield to the gentleman from Texas, but I want to get to the investment before my time is up.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Let me quickly point out to the gentleman, if I might, and to our colleagues and those who might be listening, there are a number of Members who had the opportunity to listen, perhaps not here on the floor, but in our offices, to some of the diatribe from the minority whip about the statements made by our majority leader. The statements that he attributed to the majority leader are to me surprising to say the least. He suggested that these were personal attacks on the President.

To suggest that America's lack of leadership, as the majority leader put it, and I quote: "in its most crucial moment of this half century is due in large measure to the fact that our President is not providing the direction we need," to suggest that that is a personal attack on our President I think is made all the more astounding by the fact that the only people, by the way, in the world who do not recognize the changes about, that indeed the cold war may have been won, is a group led by the rightwing fringe, those who get up here and say, "Oh well, this is a personal attack upon the President, and therefore it must be bad."

Obviously I was directed by the minority whip to read pages 3 and 4, and I brought them to the floor to reread

them. I do not find anything personal or attacking about it. I think it is perfectly legitimate under our Constitution to say that the ship of state is rudderless and that we are without a leader when it comes to leading on these issues.

So I would just say to the gentleman in the well for him to be concerned at all about being lectured is misplaced, because the lecture certainly has not been taken seriously by anybody that I know, within the hearing of my voice, at any rate.

Mr. OBEY. I think the gentleman.

What I would like to say is what I think is at issue here is not Mr. GEPHARDT's speech, even though it was a very fine speech. What is at issue here is the subject of Mr. GEPHARDT's speech, which is the adequacy of the American response to changes in the world. I would suggest that that response so far has been limp-wristed at best, and I especially think that with respect to making the investments needed to assure the American capacity for leadership in the next decade, and in the next century, we have a very big problem on our hands because of the systematic disinvestment which has occurred in the things that made America strong over the last decade. I would like to lay out what I mean by that.

If we take a look at the Federal budget as it existed in 1980 versus the Federal budget as it exists today, we will see that for programs for the elderly, the disabled, for the nonelderly poor, for economic stability; that is, unemployment compensation, commodity credit programs, things like that, general government operations, we will see that from 1980 through today we have stayed just about the same. We spent about 52 cents a year out of every dollar in 1980 for those programs and we spend about 53 cents out of every dollar for those programs today.

What are the two biggest increases? There is a big increase in interest. In 1980, before the Reagan administration, we spent 9 cents out of every budget dollar on interest. Today we are spending 15 cents out of every budget dollar on interest.

Has that strengthened the posture of the country in the trading world that we face? Has it strengthened our posture financially or economically? I suggest it has weakened it.

The interest that we have paid has increased primarily for two reasons. No. 1, because we gave large tax cuts to some very high income people to the point where today they are paying, the richest 1 percent of people in this country are paying billions and billions of dollars less into the Treasury than they would be paying on the incomes they are earning today if we had not adjusted those rates for those

making over \$100,000 below those that they were paying in 1980.

Second, we have had a very large increase in military spending, about a 50-percent increase in real dollar terms, about \$100 billion.

But what has been clobbered, what has been clobbered is the investment portion of the budget, what we invest in kids by way of education, what we invest in health by way of medical research on everything from cancer to heart disease to Alzheimer's, what has been invested in community infrastructure for the highways, the sewage treatment plants, the transit systems that are needed in order to make a community a functioning, profitable place where business can make a good profit and workers can make a good living. That has been cut from about 17 cents out of every budget dollar to about 9 cents today. That is a 40-percent reduction in terms of share of the budget. It is a 30-percent reduction in terms of the value of the purchasing power of the dollars going into those programs, and that means that we are systematically weakening America's ability to fight on the one battleground that is going to count in the 1990's, on the economic battleground, because as has been said so many times, the new battleground is not the military battlefield. The new battleground for America is the classroom, it is the trade front, and if we do not have the best prepared workers, the best trained workers, the largest amount of capital per worker in our modern plants, if we do not have that we are going to be a lot lower than first on the trading scale and a lot lower than first on the economic power scale.

The Soviet Union learned the hard way that you cannot protect military power or political power over a long period of time unless you have the economic power to back it up. And if we are not careful, what Mr. GEPHARDT was trying to point out is that if we are not careful we are going to wind up with the true winners on the economic front of the cold war being the Germans and the Japanese. That is what Mr. GEPHARDT is talking about.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, I think that is the point exactly to be made and to be taken from the entire context of the speech. In fact, if the minority whip and other rightwing fringe Members of this body want to stand up here and pick sentences out, we will pick the sentences out. I am not offended by any of the sentences that were delivered by our majority leader.

The President's lack of vision, for example, is a phrase that was used by our majority leader. I am a little tired of everybody saying the President is not at fault here when something goes wrong in this country, it is the Congress' fault. When America elects its

intellectual and moral leader of this Nation, the President of the United States, then I think it is high time for that intellectual and moral leader to stand up and be counted. What is this President going to say and do when we have the first emergency energy crisis in 1990 or 1991? Is he going to just blame Congress, or is he going to say, "Well, I probably should have been a leader."

Mr. OBEY. I would make a point about the President's budget on energy. Today in the Federal budget we are spending 60 percent less than we were providing in 1980 in real dollar terms.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. It is exactly what he is going to do, and then he is going to blame Congress.

Mr. OBEY. And if we take the President's new budget, as we know he presents that for only 1 year but he projects the budget out 5 years, and if we take a look at his 5-year projections for energy, we will see that the effective level of those programs will be taken down another 20 percent. How does that kind of a budget strengthen us on the energy front?

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Let me continue to point out what the President will do after a crisis is here. They will say it was Congress' fault, and they should have done something. I continue to repeat over and over to as many people as will listen that 535 legislators are in a very difficult position to be able to lead an entire Nation. That is what we elect the President of the United States for. The President of the United States has at his disposal all of the agencies, all of the so-called bureaucracy that seems to scare and alarm most people in this country, all of that is at his disposal to use for the benefit of leading this Nation.

To suggest that the leadership that was shown in changing of those budget priorities during the decade of Ronald Reagan has been great, I suggest, as did our majority leader, has shown a strict lack of vision, one that calls into question the President and former Vice President's ability to lead this Nation in the 1990's.

□ 1700

And I do not think it is wrong for our majority leader to ask where is the President of the United States in these changing times?

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply point out that if you are going to have some idea of where you are going to go, you first need to know where you are. The fact is if we do not understand that we are at a point in the development of our own national strength, where we are precariously close to giving away world economic leadership, then we had all better take a look at budgets again.

I think that Mr. GEPHARDT's speech yesterday was an attempt to provide the leadership from the congressional

end of Pennsylvania Avenue, what the gentleman is suggesting is often so difficult to provide. It is true that we have a very difficult time with 535 individuals representing a great many different kinds of districts, it is very true, to provide the major leadership in the country from Capitol Hill.

Nonetheless we have an obligation to try.

That is what Mr. GEPHARDT was trying to do.

But to place things again in their proper context, what people have to understand about budgets, for instance, is that no Congress since the end of World War II has ever changed any President's budget by more than about 2 percent. And that is why, if we are really to have changes in this situation so we can again rebuild our domestic investments so that we are strong enough to provide on a continuing basis economic and political and military leadership in the world, we simply have to have a much more dramatic change in budget priorities than we are getting out of the Bush White House.

With respect to foreign aid, what I believe that means is while we should not be looking for ways to greatly increase the overall foreign aid budget, we should certainly be looking for ways to change it, to modernize it, to put the money where it will do the most good. That, certainly in this day and age, given all that has happened in the world, does not mean we ought to provide large increases in military assistance as President Bush is asking us to do.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. There is one other thing that needs to be done with respect to that budget and those foreign aid requests by this President. Not one time has this President told us where in the world we are going to get the money to pay for it.

I am a little tired, as one member of the Committee on Appropriations, who also lives, as do all Members and as do all agencies and all people in this Nation, under the constraints and the restraints of the amount of money that we are allocated under the Budget Act for each of our subcommittees to spend on this Nation, whether it is for national defense, feeding program for women, infants and children, or whether it is for foreign interests that we believe are in the best interests of America.

It seems to me only appropriate we all should suggest to this President that leadership is not some trite remark, some off-the-cuff statement about "read my lips" or "a thousand points of light." It seems to me somebody is going to need to stand up in the White House someday and tell us where the money is coming from. I thank the gentleman for yielding.



Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman. I think that the record indicates that the Democratic Party in this House has cooperated to a very great degree with the Bush White House. I think we have cooperated on a number of domestic initiatives. I think we certainly cooperated fully in the bipartisan effort to try to bring a peaceful resolution at long last to Central America, and I think we have established a rather good working relationship with the Bush administration.

But I do find amusing the tone that emerges from the other side of the aisle every time someone has the temerity to suggest that somehow perhaps the judgments being made by the White House are not exactly what ought to be produced in an era of change which is this dramatic and important.

I think Mr. GEPHARDT was simply trying to lay out the fact that if we do not have a budget which is sufficiently changed to reflect the changes in the world, then we are simply wasting money and we are missing a tremendous opportunity to strengthen America when instead we appear to be weakening.

JOSE NAPOLEON DUARTE, THE STATESMAN

Mr. OBEY. Let me also just make one additional point here. One of the members of the minority indicated that he wanted to have a special order devoted to Mr. Duarte. I regret that I cannot stay around for that. But as one Member of the House who has fundamentally disagreed with the Reagan policy in Central America and as one Member who has grave doubts about the ability of the existing Salvadoran Government to in fact bring about the reforms that are necessary to justify our continuing aid, let me nonetheless, having said that, simply say that I too regret President Duarte's passing.

I think President Duarte was a statesman. I think he had an almost impossible job. I think he tried, under extremely difficult circumstances, to lead his society into a modern age where you simply do not respond to political disagreements by taking out your opposition literally, as unfortunately is the case in Salvadoran society all too often.

I also have a great deal of respect for his successor, Mr. Cristiani. But I think we would do Mr. Duarte no favor even posthumously if we neglect to focus on the need for a fundamental reevaluation of Salvadoran policy so that we can determine why it is that, after almost \$4 billion and almost 12 years of fighting, that the rebels in El Salvador still have the military capability to wade into the nation's capital and do incredible damage.

Why is it that we still have not been able to get the military to reform? Why is it that the court system down

there is a joke which would offend the sense of fairness of any American who witnessed it? What are the elements of our own policies which need to be changed in order to accomplish the kind of change that is necessary in El Salvador in order for us to be able to go to the taxpayers and say, "Your money is being spent for a productive purpose"?

It seems to me the greatest honor we could do to a fine statesman, Mr. Duarte, is for us to engage in a fundamental review of policy before it is too late to have much effect, so that in fact we can bring about the changes in El Salvador that can lead to a negotiated settlement and can lead to a decent opportunity for a decent and safe life for all of that country's population, not just the economic elite which has dominated that country for so many years and brought about the conditions which have made it fertile territory for a revolution which otherwise would never have occurred in the first place.

#### UPDATE ON THE WAR ON DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. PATTERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, one of the most important issues facing the American people today is the war on drugs. My question to my colleagues tonight and all of my friends who are paying attention is: Are we really in a war against drugs? And if so, do we really want to win it?

There are a lot of people who believe that the war on drugs that is currently undertaken is going to be an all-out effort. But I submit to you that there is reason for doubt about that, and I want to tell you why.

I recently went to Lima, Peru, and from there I flew into what is called the Upper Huallaga Valley, a valley which is about 200 miles long by 25 to 30 miles wide.

In this valley in Peru the campesinos, the small farmers there, produce two-thirds, 65 percent or so of the world's coca leaf.

Now, the coca leaf is the ingredient that makes cocaine and crack, which is destroying the minds and bodies and lives of American youth. Two-thirds of it comes out of this one valley. We know exactly where it is being produced.

Now, the President has a program that is going to be dealing with the drug problem. The President's program—and I am a very strong supporter of George Bush and I have the highest regard for him in what he is trying to accomplish and I think he is doing a great job as do most Americans—but the President's approach es-

entially revolves around three points. The first point is that we are going to educate the people, the young people of the United States, about the dangers of drugs and we are going to try to convince them that they should not use it. If we cut the demand, the argument goes, if you cut the demand, then there will not be the consumption and there will not be the production and you will not have that problem that we have in bringing this stuff across our borders.

□ 1710

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman has very important points he wants to make, but I thought I would touch on the issue of demand.

Throughout the past decade I had the opportunity to go to the United States-Mexican Parliamentary Conference, and one of the things that many of these other governments like to say to Members, and my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] participated on a number of occasions, is the issue of demand. I think that we really cannot underscore that enough, because they will so often say, "To you all in the United States, if you don't have a market for it, you all are providing. There is no reason in the world that we would be supplying."

I think that that cannot be underscored enough. I think it is very important for Members to realize that we in the United States are the ones creating the market for this. That is why the first point that the gentleman is making of the three points that the President has, and the very important fourth point that the gentleman will make, needs to be pointed out to the American people.

I thank the gentleman very much for taking this time out to focus on an important issue.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for his comments, and hope he will have more comments as I proceed.

The first point is that we have to do something about cutting the demand in this country. The second thing the President is trying to accomplish is interdiction. In December of this last year, we interdicted in New York, California, and Texas, 42 metric tons of cocaine, 42 metric tons, and it did not even make a dent in the street price. But our DEA agents and our Customs agents did a great service for this country by interdicting these drugs.

However, the drug experts in this country have said we are only getting 300 metric tons of cocaine in a year, but we interdicted 42 metric tons in one month, and it did not make a dent in the street price. Therefore, I believe we are probably getting a lot more than 300 metric tons into the United

States each year, probably like 2 or 3 times that amount. Otherwise, the price of cocaine would have gone up when the huge busts took place. Interdiction is very important, and we need to do what is necessary to help those people who are in the Upper Huallaga Valley now. Our drug enforcement agents who are risking their lives working on the problem, our DEA agents in Miami, California, and Texas and all across this country, who are risking their lives.

Likewise, we need to do what is necessary to help expand the operations of our customs agents, and give them the tools that are necessary to interdict the drugs that are coming through our ports and our airports. They need more x ray equipment and so forth to deal with this problem. I have talked to a number of them about this. We also need to do more in helping our Coast Guard. Therefore, interdiction is a very important part of the overall war against drugs.

The first thing is education, and cutting demand. The second thing is interdiction. The third thing is imposing severe penalties on the pushers. That should be up to and including the death penalty for major drug pushers, those dealing in large quantities of cocaine, PCP, heroin, other drugs, opium. Those people who are dealing, the major dealers, should be subject to the death penalty. I support the President's efforts to expand our laws in this country to be more effective, and penalize more, those who are caught dealing in drugs, particularly those major drug dealers.

However, the one thing that is not being discussed, and that is the main focus of my special order tonight, is eradication. Now, when I was in the Upper Huallaga Valley, I had an opportunity to fly to a place where they did an experimental program using a herbicide called Tebuthiuron. Tebuthiuron is very, very effective in killing coca plants. It will kill 95 or 96 percent of the coca leaf which it comes in contact with. This program that they tried, this very small program down there, showed just how effective it was.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have just had a discussion a few moments ago about the effect that Tebuthiuron has. We in California now are going through a very controversial Malathion spraying which deals with the Mediterranean fruit fly, something we have dealt with for over a decade in California. Former Gov. Jerry Brown out there was the one

who was first responsible for launching the spraying efforts.

There is a real upheaval, and I have to underscore the fact that I am very concerned about the effect that Malathion has. It ruined one of my cars before I came back here. When I see the kind of effect that Malathion has on automobiles, I cannot help but wonder what it does to a young person, or anyone's lungs, or anything else. Therefore, I guess I would like to ask the gentleman if the effectiveness of Tebuthiuron is that great in eradicating the coca leaf, what effect will it have on what our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] has been working on, which is crop substitute and incentives for the countries to substitute other crops. Also, the environmental effect that it might have. Those are the two questions I would have for the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am very glad the gentleman asked those two questions. I thank the gentleman for being so concerned about that issue.

The environmental issue is an issue that will be raised. Tebuthiuron is something that would be put on the crops in the form of small pellets. These pellets are environmentally safe, as respects other forms of plant life such as trees, grass, and other plants which would not be damaged. Only small, bushy plants like those that we would have in the coca leaf family. Now, the Tebuthiuron is put on in very small amounts. Just 3 pounds per acre will eradicate about 95 to 97 percent of the coca leaf, and two-thirds are grown in this valley. That is the first thing.

The second thing is that it will not hurt human beings. While I was in the Upper Huallaga Valley, the gentleman that flew me out there, along with all the people carrying machine guns to protect us, he took a stalk of sugar cane from the experimental project, and he ate part of that sugar cane. He took a stalk of sugar cane that was growing there and cut some of it off, and ate it to show that there was no damage to the products, or that it would be damaging to human beings that might consume products coming out of the area.

Mr. DREIER of California. Was it the great patriot Bruce Hazelwood who ate the sugar cane? He has survived a lot, having been in Special Forces in Vietnam.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It was not our good friend Bruce Hazelwood or Andy Messing with us on the trip, but a fellow who would probably not wish to be mentioned because he is with the government.

However, it will not hurt human beings.

Now, let us talk about the environment. For instance, the lungs of the world are in the Upper Amazon

Valley, the great rain forests, and we heard about how they are being cut down. In the Upper Huallaga Valley in Peru and other parts of Peru and in Bolivia, they are cutting down, literally, hundreds of thousands of acres of trees and letting them rot on the ground or burning them to make way for new coca leaf planting. Those trees, I submit to my colleagues, cutting down the trees is a much greater risk to the environment than the small amount of Tebuthiuron that will be dropped to kill the coca leaf. In addition to that, all the tributaries that lead into the Amazon River, one of the greatest rivers in the world that comes out of Peru and Bolivia and Colombia and that area, all of those tributaries are being saturated with millions of gallons of chemicals that are used to process the coca leaf. They are dumping that into rivers, killing the fish, killing the wildlife that drinks out of the rivers, and destroying all the things, all the vegetation growing along the tributaries that lead into the Amazon.

Therefore, when Members talk about environment, Tebuthiuron will have a minimal effect on the environment down there, but it will have a great impact on cleaning up the environment because if those countries that are allowing coca leaves to be produced, now we will come in and eradicate them, they will not cut down the trees because it will not be necessary. I think it will be an environmentally positive thing for us in dealing with the coca leaf production, by dropping Tebuthiuron on these plants and in that valley and elsewhere.

Now we can find out through our spy satellites, which are all around the world now, exactly where large quantities of coca leaf are being grown. There is no question we we can find out where it is. We already know where two-thirds of the world's coca leaf is being grown, and that is the Upper Huallaga Valley. The president of that country, Mr. Garcia, met with President Bush in Cartagena, along with the President of Bolivia and the President of Columbia. They talked about an agreement that would deal with the coca problem. We are going to be appropriating, at least it was suggested to Members by Mr. Bennett, our drug chief, about last week, that we were asked on the Committee on Foreign Affairs to authorize \$708 million to be appropriated for DEA support, for support for the Peruvian military and the Bolivian military and the Colombian military and for other purposes, to help interdict and stop the production of cocaine in those countries.

□ 1720

But President Garcia has said publicly in speeches before the people



who are producing the coca leaf down there that he will do nothing to stop coca leaf production. The fellow who is running for President and who is the likely successor to Mr. Garcia, I have been told, has said in speeches that he wants to decriminalize or legalize coca leaf and cocaine use in Peru. He has talked about that in speeches. That does not sound like people who are committed to the eradication of the problem of cocaine in those countries, let alone the problem of the cocaine that is getting into the United States in large quantities.

So I submit to our administration and to our President that the only way we are going to get cocaine stopped is to do the three things the administration is talking about and also the fourth thing, and that is the eradication of the product at its source. We will never in my opinion win the war against drugs until we have as part of our program the eradication of the drugs at their source. That means going in and using tebuthiuron, or whatever herbicide is necessary, to stop the production of those products at their source.

Now, how do we do that? This is the part that gets real sticky, and this is the part that is going to receive a lot of criticism from my friends and colleagues, and that is that we have to tell the Presidents of those countries at some point in the future that we are coming in with aircraft to fly over those areas and drop these herbicides in large quantities on these coca fields so we can kill it. It would take about 5 days to 6 days with our planes flying up and down the upper Huallaga Valley to drop enough herbicides to kill 97 percent of the production in that country.

Now, if we were to do that, the first thing the President of that country would say is: "My gosh, that is an invasion of our territory. That is a violation of our sovereignty."

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am probably going to cover what the gentleman is going to ask, but go ahead.

Mr. DREIER of California. I just wanted to say this: The only reason I jumped back up is that I wanted to ask, why in the world do we have to say that we are going to do it? Why do we have to say that we are going to launch it? Why can we not just propose it at a summit like the one we had at Cartagena, where Garcia and Paz Zamora and Barco met with President Bush in a coordinated joint effort? That is just one of the things we have done in trying to deal with the situation in Mexico.

In the past we have had joint efforts along with the Government of Mexico, and I would hope very much that Bolivia, Peru, and Colombia would join

with us, rather than just having us say we are going to fly in. I say that because they obviously want to see this brought to an end, based on the efforts that President Barco and others have seen in their countries.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am not so sure that the other leaders down there have the same dedication to the elimination of the problem as President Barco has. I think President Barco is to be commended for what he has done in Colombia. I think it is a political problem, and I also think there is a modicum or maybe a large amount of corruption in those governments because there is so much money involved.

There are 200,000 campesinos in Peru and I do not know how many in Bolivia, probably 50,000 or 60,000, that are planting or growing coca leaf. So there are perhaps 200,000 people who have a voice in government there who are concerned about losing their income that is being derived from coca leaf production.

In addition to that, there is probably another million people who are dealing in manufacturing coca paste and producing actual cocaine to send to the United States. There are probably 4 or 5 times as many of those as there are actual coca farmers. I am not concerned about that million, but I think that those politicians probably are down there, and I think they are also extremely concerned about those small campesinos or farmers who are planting the coca leaf.

So here is what I think should be done, and I say to the President, "Mr. President, if you are paying attention to this special order tonight, I hope you will at least take under advisement what I am going to be saying and also what you will be reading in the papers in the weeks to come because I am going to be sending these as op-ed pieces to many of the publications across this country, hoping they will print them, because I think it is something that needs to be discussed at the very least."

The idea is that at 6 a.m. in the morning our President calls the President of Peru or Bolivia—probably it would be Peru first—and he says, "Mr. President, first of all, I apologize for waking you at such an early hour, and, second, I want to tell you that we are committed in the United States to winning the war on drugs, and toward that end we have decided the only way to stop the cocaine from coming into the United States in large quantities is to eradicate it. So we are flying up and down the Huallaga Valley, starting at this time, and dropping the herbicides—it might be tebuthiuron, it might be something else—in quantities large enough to eradicate that coca leaf."

The first thing that president is going to say, whether it is Garcia or

his successor, is: "Oh, my gosh, you can't do that. You are violating our territorial boundaries."

And we should say at that time, through our President, "We understand you are going to be upset about that. We fully expect you to take this to the U.N., we would not expect you to do otherwise, but we are in a war against drugs and hundreds of thousands of our young people are dying or being ruined for life because of that cocaine, no less than if you were making bombs in that valley and bringing them into our country and blowing up people. So since we are in a war against drugs, we are not attacking any of your population, but we are attacking that crop. We know that you have a political problem, and we know you are going to have an economic problem, and because of that we are going to help each one of those campesinos who are not going to be able to make a living off coca for the next 18 months or year or 2 years by giving them a stipend which will be fairly close to what they were making off the coca leaf."

So that takes away the economic argument, and it will save us millions and millions, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars, by doing it that way instead of trying other approaches which are being talked about and which are actually being implemented right now.

Now, when they go to the U.N. and start complaining about that, then I think our ambassador to the U.N. has to say the things we have talked about tonight, and that is that "we know we are going up against drugs, and we know we can interdict, we can educate, we can help put people in jail who are dealing with drugs, but until we stop the product from being made and produced, we are never going to win the battle; the war will go on and on, and hundreds of thousands of young people, maybe millions, will ultimately suffer, and many will die."

So the bottom line in my view is that the President has to be willing to do what is absolutely necessary to win the war on drugs. We got a lot of heat from going into Panama, but it was the right thing to do. We got a lot of heat for going into Grenada, but it was the right thing to do. I submit that until and unless we can get the presidents of those countries to go along with an eradication program, we have no choice but to take the war to the cocaine producers in those valleys and eradicate those things as quickly as possible, because if we do not, they are going to be turned from coca leaf into coca paste and into cocaine and crack, and it is going to be killing America youth.

Now, people may say, "Congressman BURTON, you are on the Foreign Affairs Committee and you are one of

those guys who are supposed to deal in a diplomatic way with members of foreign governments. Won't this cause a hue and cry across the world?"

Of course it is going to cause a hue and cry against our action, but my answer is this: I hate to offend foreign leaders, but if it comes to a choice between offending foreign leaders by going across their property and their land and spraying those crops with tebuthiuron, or whatever kind of herbicide we are talking about, to kill the coca leaf, if it comes to a choice between doing that and seeing hundreds of thousands of young Americans die or be ruined for life because of that product that is coming into this country, there is no choice to be made.

We as a Congress or as a people are supposed to defend the lives and the liberties of the people of this country, and people are dying because that coca leaf is being grown and produced, and it is being produced right now. We know exactly where it is being grown, and we are not doing anything about it but trying to interdict it, and that will not work. That will not get the job done. We will never win the war against drugs until we go to the source and eradicate the product before it becomes cocaine, or whatever ultimately the drug is going to be.

So I say to my colleagues tonight that I hope they will take this under advisement, and I say to our President tonight: "Mr. President, I hope you will take these thoughts under advisement, and I hope you will ultimately come to the conclusion that either we get those presidents and those leaders of those other countries to go along with an eradication program that will work or we will do it ourselves, because we will never win the war against drugs until we do."

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JOSE NAPOLEON DUARTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. PATTERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, over the past several months we have witnessed some incredible changes in the world. Needless to say, what I have just said is an understatement.

We have also seen some great leaders play dynamic roles in those changes. We have seen Lech Walesa, Ronald Reagan, and Vaclav Havel, both of whom have stood right behind us in the last several months, and there have been a number of other leaders who have stood here and said great things. There have also been some who have not had the chance to stand here. When I think about the descriptions of what we have seen happen in the last several months, I cannot help but think of a statement

that was made right here on October 18 of last year by the President of South Korea, who really described the changes that we have seen in the most incredible way.

We all know, Madam Speaker, that Roh Tae Woo is not an English-speaking person, but out of respect for us he spoke to us in English, and he said this:

"The forces of freedom and liberty are eroding the foundations of closed societies, and the efficiency of the market economy and the benefits of an open society have become undeniable."

□ 1730

Madam Speaker, these universal ideals, symbolized by the United States of America, have begun to undermine the fortresses of repression. That statement was given right here, Madam Speaker, by President Roh Tae Woo, and it to me describes the goals that were established by one of the great world leaders who just 2 weeks ago passed away, and I am referring, of course, to President Jose Napoleon Duarte who served as President of El Salvador.

El Salvador, as we all know, is an issue which has been hotly debated on the floor of this Congress for years, and years and years. Like the issue of Nicaragua, it, just when I came here in 1980, actually January 1981, was one of the issues that was being discussed because we of course saw the tragic murder of the nuns which took place in 1980. We also saw over that decade and those several years in early 1980 tremendous problems, horrible death squad activities which saw up to a thousand people a month murdered in El Salvador.

Madam Speaker, through that struggle we saw a person who had been a political leader in that country for years, had been forced into exile by a military government, emerge and become truly a great leader, one who struggled for peace, was himself a victim of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front when his daughter was tragically, tragically kidnapped by the FMLN. Many of his close friends and allies were brutally murdered by the FMLN, and yet his resolve never waned. He stayed tough, and he was able to live to see what he wanted to live to see, and that was the transition from one democratically elected government to another, which was the first time in the history of El Salvador that that actually took place.

In addition, Madam Speaker, I think it is very, very important for us to recognize how grateful we are that Jose Napoleon Duarte, who according to many physicians was going to be dead long before that transition took place, did in fact live to see it, and I will never forget on June 1 of last year, when I had the privilege of going

along with Senator LUGAR, the distinguished colleague of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] to represent President Bush at the inauguration of Alfredo Cristiani, and while there were many domestic political struggles that existed between the Christian Democrats and the Arena Party in El Salvador, at that huge stadium on January 1 there was not a dry eye in the stadium when we saw Jose Napoleon Duarte embrace his successor, President Alfredo Cristiani.

Madam Speaker, when we look at the life of Jose Napoleon Duarte, it is one which certainly is a very full one. He was born in 1925. His family had been very politically active over the years. He was educated right here in the United States in a place called Notre Dame University. I know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], my friend, is familiar with that institution. He served as mayor of San Salvador during the 1960's. He was founder of the Salvadoran Boy Scout program. He founded the Salvadoran Anti-Tuberculosis League and managed the Salvadoran Red Cross for a number of years. He appeared well on his way to serving as president in 1972, before Salvadoran soldiers halted the vote and actually imprisoned Mr. Duarte, during which time he was tortured and was left, as all of us have seen on many occasions, with severe scars on his face.

Finally, as I said a few moments ago, Jose Napoleon Duarte was driven out of the country. He returned in 1979 to a nation that was clearly beset by violence. He was able to come through a civilian military junta to the presidency in 1980, and ultimately in 1984, after a long struggle he was able to become elected president of the country.

Madam Speaker, in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds Jose Napoleon Duarte laid the foundations for continued political pluralism in a dramatic reduction of death squad activity.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I hate to interrupt the train of thought of the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] because I know that he has a very detailed history of Napoleon Duarte.

I think President Duarte was probably one of the great leaders of our time in Central America because he was able to get the people all together and headed in the right direction during his tenure in office, and had it not been for the herculean efforts of Duarte, there would not have been the free elections that took place just last



year when Cristiani was elected president.

So, Madam Speaker, I think that although we may have had some philosophical differences with Mr. Duarte, he was a Social Democrat, and not as conservative as many Members of the Congress would have liked.

We have to say unequivocally that he brought democracy to that country, and he carried out his tenure in office in a very fine manner, and had it not been for his conducting himself the way he did in office, we probably would not see democracy flourishing in El Salvador today.

Granted, there are still a lot of problems, but I would say that country and the entire world, particularly our hemisphere, owes Napoleon Duarte a tremendous thank you.

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is absolutely right, and I thank him for his fine contribution.

Madam Speaker, when one looks at the kind of reception that President Duarte got when he came to this country, we provided ovations to him, my colleagues will recall, and shortly after he was elected President, when he came, I remember the Committee on Foreign Affairs room, and he gave a very stirring address to us.

When my colleagues think about the fact, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] points out very well, of moving on the road toward pluralism, openness and democracy was really the goal that he had. And of course he desperately wanted to insure that the three goals of the people of El Salvador and people throughout the world were implemented, those goals being peace, stability, and economic recovery, and I think that the work that President Duarte did very clearly moved us along the road in doing that.

For example, Madam Speaker, in 1984 he was able to successfully perceive with conviction those individuals who were responsible for the tragic murder of those nuns, which was a situation which really caused, as we know, a stir throughout the world—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield just for a second on that point?

Mr. DREIER of California. I would yield further to my friend.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. For those of our colleagues who may be paying attention to this, that was no easy task because the military has been extremely strong on El Salvador and a lot of the Central American countries, and for a president to take to task people who violated the law and committed these kinds of atrocities is a real show of strength in a man's character, and he risked his life, and he risked his presidency to a degree by doing that, and he really was a giant of a man.

Mr. DREIER of California. We all know with the action of the FMLN in kidnapping his daughter that he certainly was very personally drawn into this, and it is a very tragic irony that now President Cristiani is faced with the challenge of dealing with the murder of those Jesuits who last November 16 were tragically killed at the Central American University, and there of course have been dramatic improvements, and we have to recognize that.

As I was saying a few moments ago, a thousand people a month died from those tragic death squad activities. Last year the number of deaths was tragically 200. It was 200 in that year, and had it not been for the strong efforts of President Jose Napoleon Duarte, there is no doubt in my mind whatsoever that we would not have seen the kind of improvement which we have.

Then of course, Madam Speaker, we can shift to neighboring Nicaragua and the fact that the Gulf of Fonseca has been used as a route through which Soviet bloc weapons have come in to destabilize the Government of El Salvador, and President Duarte tragically died just before we saw that free and fair election take place in Nicaragua.

□ 1740

I am convinced that will be the beginning of the FMLN Communist guerrillas.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Well, if the gentleman will yield further, we all hope so. I would just like to say that Jose Napoleon Duarte, a graduate of Notre Dame and the University of Indiana, may have known about the outcome of that election after all. He may after his passing, having made it to heaven, see that democracy is flourishing not only in El Salvador, but will flourish in Nicaragua as well. If democracy changes the makeup of the Communist Sandinista military in Nicaragua, I think the gentleman in the well is absolutely correct in that the FMLN's days are numbered, because they will not be getting those supplies that they received before.

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for his comments.

I am not going to go through the litany because we have heard time and time again of the tragic deaths of government leaders and other officials, mayors, judges, which the FMLN is responsible for in El Salvador, these brutal murders.

We have, of course, constantly seen on the news the tragic news of Father Ignacio Ellacuria and the five other Jesuits and their housekeeper and daughter. I was along with the Moakley task force investigating this just a few weeks ago in El Salvador, but I think it is important to underscore the

fact that there have been literally dozens and dozens of top government leaders, the attorney general, who have been brutally murdered by the FMLN.

President Duarte and now President Cristiani are standing up against that. Again it was President Duarte who clearly laid the groundwork.

I am pleased that President Duarte has been recognized in the United States as a clear leader. It is not often that I quote, I think it is the New York Times editorial on President Duarte. This was about a year and a half ago, talking about his illness that had taken place and the kind of leadership that he had offered. They said:

But he has been that most valuable and admirable of politicians, a serious and decent person who chose to devote himself over the decades to the seemingly impossible mission of moving from his religious faith to the building of democracy in just about the most inhospitable circumstances imaginable. For his efforts he has suffered grievous personal and family injury at the hands of right and left alike. Yet he has persisted in dutifully advancing the civilizing democratic element in a political landscape dominated by barbarities. He has sought to create the institutions of a modern, self-governing society in a place where caprice and violence otherwise hold sway. Against immense odds he has struggled to create a center and make it hold.

I think that very clearly outlines the struggle that he was up against and how effectively he dealt with it.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I just want to end my participation in this special order by saying that I think that newspaper article says it very, very well. Napoleon Duarte was a great man, a great leader, and he will be missed.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for taking this special order.

Mr. DREIER of California. I thank my friend for his contribution.

There are a few other quotes, Madam Speaker, that I would like to enter into the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, I would like to continue briefly by quoting the former U.S. Ambassador to Venezuela under President Carter, who said, "The key figure in Salvadoran politics in the last decade was President Duarte." He lauded him by saying that he was trying to build a shield against the insurgency, but behind it to produce reform, which if you think about it is an incredible challenge he was up against, to produce a shield from that insurgency and behind that shield to produce the kind of reform which we are now seeing and, of course, that transition which we saw take place last year was evidence of.

Another former Carter Ambassador to El Salvador commented, "He stood

for reform, negotiation, and an end to the savagery of the armed forces."

President Oscar Arias of Costa Rica, who has been in the news certainly a great deal, described President Duarte as a man of peace who has left us. He fought for democracy like no one else.

One of his closest friends remarked,

He will be remembered as having begun a process, for having created a tendency toward democracy, despite serious mistakes. He believes in democracy and tried to create one in extremely difficult circumstances.

Now, if you look at a number of the other statements that have come out, I remember this one back in 1985 when Time magazine said:

Basketball may have been Duarte's game in college, but now he played high wire artist, poised between his country's extreme right and radical left.

Well, Madam Speaker, as we proceed to look at the legacy of President Duarte and the challenges which now are left with President Cristiani and others, tremendous gains have been made, but much remains to be done. We know that last November, tragically following months of peaceful negotiations, launched by the FLMN, a massive urban assault took place, beginning on November 11, just 2 days after the Berlin Wall went down. It is very unfortunate to see the way the FLMN had operated, not only throughout the years of President Duarte's life, but the way they have continued in recent months with this assault.

What they have done, Madam Speaker, is that when they have been losing on the battlefield, shifted to the negotiation table, and once they have spent a great deal of time at the negotiating table, they have been able to regroup and launch things like the November 11 assault on El Salvador.

I think President Duarte was one who recognized the necessity to be very vigilant. Seventeen times President Duarte attempted to negotiate with the FLMN, and yet virtually every time the negotiating process was going on, the FLMN was planning another major military assault against the people and the duly elected Government of El Salvador. Unfortunately, we see it today.

Madam Speaker, I continue to be optimistic. I am optimistic that the life of President Jose Napoleon Duarte was one which paved the way for peace, stability and economic recovery in El Salvador. It is not going to happen overnight. In fact, President Duarte in his inaugural address, warned against great expectations.

He said:

Are we going to arrive at perfection? It is a satisfying thought, but I think not. We are human.

Well, it is obvious that President Duarte did not see El Salvador arrive at perfection, but he certainly can be very proud, as can members of his

family and all of his supporters for the fact that he did lay the groundwork for the kind of peace and stability which I hope and pray the Cristiani government will be able to enjoy in the next several years to come. There are many challenges which lie ahead. I believe one of the most important things that we can do in the name of President Jose Napoleon Duarte is to have a consistent United States policy toward El Salvador. A consistent policy is essential. There are many people who have called for an immediate end to any kind of aid to that duly elected government. I think it would be a real mistake for us to do that now, because improvement has been made, as I pointed out, with that reduction from a thousand a month death squad activities to 200 last year. Again, not perfection, but certainly improvement, and it is absolutely essential that we have a consistent policy, and if for no other reason, Madam Speaker, we should have that consistent policy from the United States Government in the name of one of El Salvador and the world's most courageous heroes, Jose Napoleon Duarte.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my profound sadness upon the death of Jose Napoleon Duarte, former President of the Republic of El Salvador.

President Duarte was educated in the United States, at the University of Notre Dame, and remained a devoted friend of this Nation throughout his distinguished career. President Duarte was a beacon of democracy in his beleaguered nation, and we here in Washington recognized his commitment. In fact, the affection and esteem the United States Government held for President Duarte endured long after his electoral popularity in Nicaragua began to dwindle.

Throughout his tenure as President, and even after his defeat in a reelection bid, Jose Napoleon Duarte was an outspoken advocate of democratic reform in El Salvador. Mr. Duarte was an adroit politician, adept at walking the tightrope of political conciliation. He diligently worked investigating the myriad allegations of human rights abuses in Nicaragua, and he did his very best to get the Nicaraguan business community to pledge its capital and skills to make life better for his fellow countrymen.

In a nation torn by violence, suffering and poverty, Mr. Duarte's leadership provided a ray of light. He will be missed by those of us who knew him, and we express our deepest sympathies to his family.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues as they rise one by one to honor a man who fought courageously and with infinite tenacity not only in his battle against a tragic illness but also in his steadfast commitment to bring a better life to the people of El Salvador.

President Jose Napoleon Duarte was universally respected and admired by his friends and by his adversaries for his tireless efforts and visionary leadership to foster peace, democracy, and stability both in his nation and

throughout the Western Hemisphere. As the first democratically elected President in El Salvador in more than 50 years, his struggle to bring his country from chaos and despotism to democracy was an inspiration to all Americans.

As we in the Congress take leave one last time of our faithful and noble ally, I hope each of us will do all we can to bring about a lasting monument to Jose Napoleon Duarte: the establishment of peace and democracy in El Salvador. We can do no less to honor this man.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. PATTERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### PROCESS IN THE 101ST CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Madam Speaker, I would like to take about 30 of my 60 minutes to just talk about process in the present session of the 101st Congress. I am greatly disturbed about the way some things are being orchestrated. The process will determine in many cases the results and the results I think will be bad results because of an unusual process.

□ 1750

I would like to take just three bills that I think are very important and express my concern about the way they are being moved in this House. The Americans with Disabilities Act I am greatly concerned about. That is an act we started in 1987, I think, and continued in 1988, and in 1989 there was a great renegotiation that took place. That is the Tony Coelho bill. Tony Coelho was a sponsor, and he led the negotiations. The Senate, the House, the president agreed, a bill was passed in the Senate in 1989 fairly early in the session, and then it was referred to four committees in the House.

The Americans With Disabilities Act is a very important bill. It affects the civil rights of 43 million Americans. I think that nothing is more important than completing the civil rights agenda and guaranteeing to these 43 million Americans their civil rights in order to enable them to become more productive citizens.

I think also that the second bill that concerns me is very important also,



H.R. 3, the child care bill, which went through a process of 3 years of negotiations and hearing in the Committee on Education and Labor. We had numerous hearings. We had negotiations with numerous groups about problems related to the bill, and there was a consensus finally reached. The bill passed from the subcommittee. It passed out of the committee into the House. It passed on the floor of the House. But in the conference process, the bill was killed last year.

We see no signs of that bill now in the pipeline except in strange comments that are being produced sometimes by constituents of mine. I was shocked to have some constituents of mine come to my office to talk about the child care bill, and they reported to me that there were certain Congressmen who informed them that some Congressmen had gone to the White House and met with White House operatives, and a deal had been made about the child care bill, and the only bill that had any chance of passing and not being vetoed by the President was the bill based on the deal that they had made. But I have not seen the deal bill. I have not seen the results of this behind-the-scenes deal which had no hearings, no negotiations that I know of other than the supposed White House deal. So I am concerned about that.

I am concerned also about H.R. 1675, which might be called the President's initiative to promote excellence in education. This morning the Elementary and Secondary Schools Subcommittee voted to postpone the markup for this President's initiative to promote excellence in education, the bill H.R. 1675. I am very concerned about why that bill was rushed to us, and there is a push to get that bill acted upon in a House which is not concerned about the child care bill, and takes so much time to draft, in a House of Representatives that seems not to be concerned about the movement of the Americans With Disabilities Act. I am very concerned about that one, and every day that goes by, things get more complicated.

Here is a bill the President agreed upon from the very beginning, and it had White House support, the Senate passed it by a wide margin, the Committee on Education and Labor voted it out last November. Why is the Americans With Disabilities Act being dragged slowly through the House, while at the same time H.R. 1675, the President's initiative to promote excellence, is being rushed?

We have serious doubts about the results that will be achieved. We know there will be no positive results if this particular President's initiative to promote excellence is rushed. We would like more time to take a closer look at it.

I am concerned, and to go back in more detail and talk about the Ameri-

cans With Disabilities Act, I think it is important for Members of the House as well as the American people in general to understand that it was very much supported by the President. President Bush started in 1988, and I quoting the President, "I am going to do whatever it takes to make sure the disabled are included in the mainstream. They are not going to be left out anymore." The President supported the bill, which passed the Senate by a vote of 76 to 8, 76 in favor, in September 1989.

Unfortunately, following the raft of favorable publicity the White House received for its positive stand on the bill following Senate passage, the administration has been notably inactive after they got the publicity and the credit, and everybody was applauding including myself. I applauded the President for his positive action, and suddenly the administration has become notably inactive to round up House Republicans to support the legislation.

Yesterday as ADA was being marked up in the House subcommittee, another strange thing happened. The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, and as I said before, four different committees have jurisdiction over the bill, and the only one that has passed it in the House so far is the Committee on Education and Labor following the leadership of my Subcommittee on Select Education, but yesterday as ADA was being marked up in the House Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, a rumor began to circulate that the administration was no longer in favor of the bill. It was brought to my attention by some alarmed members of the community of people with disabilities. The leadership there were quite upset by the fact that as a result of this dragging in the House, these kinds of complications had begun to develop, and suddenly the President and the administration had indicated they were no longer interested in the bill. That was the rumor. I do not know at this point how true that rumor was.

There are some counterrumors saying that is not so, but the White House has not made a statement recently on where it stands on the bill.

It is true that the House of Representatives and the committees that are now controlling the bill are under the jurisdiction of Democrats. I am baffled as to why Democrats take so long in moving a bill which the community of people with disabilities, those who are most affected, both Democrats and Republicans have agreed is an excellent bill, and they have agreed it is a practical bill, and it is not everything they wanted, but they agreed it is a bill they can live with and would be enthusiastic about if only we would go on to pass it. They have applauded the President. They have applauded the

Senate. But the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives is dragging its feet.

As a result, we have these rumors beginning to circulate and new complications develop. It would help if the White House would tell us where it stands on the act, and it would help the process certainly, and it would help the process if the Democratic leadership would tell us where it stands, and beyond telling us where it stands, use its muscle to move the bill.

We would like to see the Americans with Disabilities Act passed.

Unfortunately yesterday I am told by members of the disability community, and I have not had a chance to analyze it very closely, but they say that members of the Committee on Public Works passed an amendment which seemed to water down one of the provisions in the act. I will investigate that further. I find it very strange that any subcommittee or committee of Democrats would be watering down a civil rights bill for people with disabilities which has already been approved and passed overwhelmingly by the Senate and very much endorsed, at least one time, by the President. This legislation represents a strong effort on the part of the U.S. Government to expand the parameters of our own democracy, as I said before, by including 43 million citizens into the American mainstream. It is long overdue and will benefit our entire Nation.

Americans all across the land are cheering on the heroic efforts of nations all over the world who are aggressively asserting the democratic ideals our country stands for, and these other nations are changing their entire structure of their governments in ways considered unimaginable even a year ago.

Americans with disabilities who want to participate fully in American life are wondering, if the forces for democracy and participation can prevail in Eastern and Central Europe against formidable obstacles, why cannot our great Nation pass this legislation so rooted in our democratic ethos and ideals and pass the legislation without devastating weakening amendments, why the forces for freedom are winning victories around the world, but they are struggling to have their message acted on in the freedom and opportunity-loving United States?

This legislation represents a concrete opportunity for America to reassert world leadership in the promotion of freedom and opportunity and the establishment of human rights for a severely disadvantaged minority. They have a large minority. It is 43 million people. They spread across the whole United States. They are in every congressional district.

□ 1800

The Canadian Parliament is sending a delegation to Washington later this month to learn more about what the United States is doing in establishing civil rights for people with disabilities. That is ironic, is it not?

Will the President lift a finger to get this legislation passed in a worthy and effective form, or will he continue to be distracted by whatever the White House's issue of the week happens to be?

Will the White House lead on this issue or will it continue to drift? I think the disabled community knows the difference between rhetorical commitment and a real commitment to their civil rights. They want to know where the President stands and what is the true depth of his commitment on the most important piece of legislation affecting them that the Federal Government has ever considered.

They have little regard for Republican Members of Congress who posture by offering amendments to strengthen the bill in committee that they know will not pass, and which they unalterably oppose behind closed doors.

People with disabilities are tired of being told in their districts or in letters that their Representative cosponsors a bill even as he or she gives the big wink to efforts to weaken its transportation provisions, and transportation is a particular problem.

The White House chooses to roll the dice and risk losing the credibility and good will it has created with Americans with disabilities.

I call upon my colleagues in the House to take a firm stand against the White House's shenanigans, to assert our commitment to freedom, opportunity, and full civil rights protection for Americans with disabilities, and a strong America that such an act will bring about.

No reason has been given for the White House's vacillation. The bill that will ultimately go to the House floor will likely be a weaker bill than the Senate-passed version which he endorsed.

I am blaming the President, but, of course, I imply and I will state straight out the President obviously has to manipulate some Democrats in order to accomplish this as the bill is now before the Democratic-controlled House.

The bill that will ultimately go to the House floor we do not want to be weaker than the bill the Senate has passed already. If the President continues to waiver, to sit on the sidelines as this great crusade for human freedom reaches its crucial moment, I say to my colleagues let us go ahead. Let us seize the initiative as Democrats and pass the bill without his support, and resoundingly override a veto if it comes to that. But I do not think it will come to that, because basically

the bill does have bipartisan support. There are great pressure groups mounting, certainly in the area of people who are in the transportation business, that have begun to confuse the issue and begun to make some people stray, but basically it is a strongly supported bipartisan bill.

We have a historic opportunity, but I hope that we do not let a messy process, a wavering by Democrats, a baffling reluctance to go ahead and do what is right. Let us do what is right for the people with disabilities in America and pass this bill out of the House.

In the same vein I would urge that H.R. 3, the child care bill, or a bill very similar to the child care bill which passed the House last fall, that that bill go forward and be considered the only legitimate child care bill, the only bill with real credibility, the only bill with great substance, the only bill that has had the benefit of the debate and the negotiations and the consensus process with various groups.

H.R. 3, the child care bill, should have the support of the leadership in this House. It should have the support of every Member of Congress. No substitute that has been offered has been taken through the same process.

If we have alternatives that are being offered seriously, then I urge those people who have those alternatives to come forward, to hold hearings on their bills, to give us a chance to take a close look at it, and not to send pronouncements down from their committees or subcommittees that they have gone to the White House and they have made a deal and that that is the only thing that is going to happen.

The whole process of dealmaking I strongly protest. Of course, there are good deals and bad deals, but when deals are made without the benefit of the democratic process, of the Legislature which has already held hearings, negotiations, and so forth, you make deals after you have gone through that process, deals are made ahead of time leapfrogging over the process, and those can only be bad deals.

Whereas some people pride themselves on being able to go to the White House and make those kinds of deals, I would caution certainly the members of the Democratic Party from participating too often in those kinds of deals for sanctioning. If our party leadership, our caucus, sanctions dealmaking, then what are we doing? The end of the two-party system is at hand. Because always instead of supporting a party position and giving the people of America the benefit of seeing the position of both parties and hearing a debate and making up their minds about which one is right, we will only have one party, and that is the party which controls the White House.

The party which controls the White House has a great deal of leverage. We will have numerous other little caucuses and groups that decide they want to make their deals. As soon as they have some leverage, something to make a deal with, they will go and make a deal.

I want to caution the Democratic leadership and the American people in general that we will be moving in the wrong direction, toward a one-party system, while the rest of the world is moving toward multiparty systems. Even the Soviet Union. Even Mr. Gorbachev concedes in theory it will be a good idea to have a multiparty system.

In the meantime we have the appearance of a two-party system while dealmaking behind the scenes cuts down the effectiveness and significance of our second party. I do not want to be a member of a second party.

I would caution people who believe in dealmaking to stop and think about the fact that every group has the possibility of a deal. When dealmaking becomes the norm instead of the exception, we can all go and make some deal, which may very much destroy the fabric of the party that is not in the White House.

So dealmakers, beware. What you have done on H.R. 3 I hope will not prevail. I certainly hope that the members of Congress will look at H.R. 3 as the only legitimate, credible child care bill and go forward to take action on that bill.

Finally I would like to comment on H.R. 1675, the Presidential initiatives to promote excellence in education.

Just the opposite has happened. The President, there is a big push from somewhere to act and act immediately on H.R. 1675. Some people argue that, well, it is not an unusual push. The drive to get immediate passage on this bill is not unusual because the President did introduce it a year ago. A whole year has gone by. You should have seen it, you should have discussed it, and should be ready to act upon it.

We voted to postpone action on this this morning in the Subcommittee on Elementary and Secondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. We voted to postpone it because we said we want more time to accomplish the following. We think it is very important that the bill is a year old. In that respect it is somewhat obsolete because developments related to education have been moving so rapidly and there are so many different entities involved that we need to stop and see what is the impact of those entities on the proposals that have been made in H.R. 1675 by the President. What is the impact of the process that the President himself has set in motion?



The President called a conference of Governors. Now those Governors have come back with a set of goals. The President has endorsed that set of goals that the Governors came back with.

Now, where in this bill are those goals addressed? Why can we not have a new initiative by the President, a revision at least of his old initiative, to reflect the fact that the Governors adopted certain goals?

In addition to the goals the Governors adopted, there are other people who are very concerned about education and have spent a great deal of time in analyzing the problem and coming forward with some proposals. Those other people who want to propose goals and who want to be in on this starting process of revamping the American education system, their proposals for goals should also be considered.

I certainly would like the process of the subcommittee which I head, the Subcommittee on Select Education, to be considered as we move toward prioritizing a first initiatives bill. This is going to be the first step the President takes in what I assume will be a series of steps which will result in the revamping of education in America.

Now, my subcommittee put out a report in September 1988 which was entitled "Preliminary Staff Report on Educational Research, Development, and Dissemination: Reclaiming a Vision of the Federal Role for the 1990's and Beyond."

I would like to, in addition to the goals of the Governors, have the goals that we set forth in our report be considered.

On page 9 of that report we set forth some goals which we say should be realized by the year 2000. I will read a few of those goals.

By the year 2000 we said we should fully implement early childhood programs to cover all eligible children.

I think the President is on the same wavelength as we are on that one, because he at least in his new initiatives with respect to the budget for education has proposed an increase in the amount of money for early childhood programs via Head Start.

An increase in money for Head Start moves us a few inches forward. If only he would adopt our full goal and say that we want to fully implement early childhood programs so that every child that is eligible, who meets eligibility requirements in terms of poverty, background, et cetera, that every child will be considered by Head Start in the next 5 years. He has appropriated some additional dollars. More children can be covered if we pass the President's budget, as we will, with respect to Head Start.

We would like to go forward and have a commitment made to increase

that every year until every child who is eligible is covered.

□ 1810

We have another goal. We said we think we should achieve a 90-percent graduation rate for high school. We are quite happy that it seems somebody in the President's entourage read our report and at least agreed with that one exactly, because that is what the President proposes, to achieve by the year 2000, a 90-percent graduation rate for our high schools, to have 90 percent of our youngsters in our schools graduating. So we applaud that particular goal.

However, we also said we would like to see the introduction of Oriental and Slavic language studies into every high school in America. We think in order to get the advantage, in order to be able to deal with our competitors throughout the world, our students and our next generation needs to speak more languages. Whereas French, Spanish, and certain basic European languages are widely taught, there are very few classes across the country teaching Oriental and Slavic language, particularly Oriental languages since we are immediately, every day facing the intense competition from Japan.

One reason that Japan succeeds so well in their competition is that a large number of the Japanese businessmen and their technicians underneath them, the people in the advertising world speak English, and anybody who has ever studied languages knows that when you study them you do not just study words, but you study the background of the people, and the nuances of the languages. There are a lot of things that languages tell us about people, and when we know those things, we can prepare advertisements, and we can deal with catalogs, and we can do a number of things with the process of selling products when we know the language, many more things than we can if we do not know. For the American businessman going to Japan, what they have to do is hire some Japanese to deal with doing their advertising and a number of other things that cannot be done unless you know the language. They lose the advantage right away.

So the introduction of Oriental and Slavic languages, that is a moderate goal. We just say introduce them, have at least the alternative presented to students who want to take Oriental and Slavic languages in every high school in America by the year 2000. We think that goal is as important as any goal that has been enunciated here.

We would also like to see the doubling of the number of minority graduates who come out of college and enter the teaching profession. We would like to see, instead of the trend

now where fewer and fewer minorities, Latinos and African-Americans, fewer and fewer go into teaching every year, so there is a declining curve where we have fewer, now many fewer than we had 10 years ago, and the rate is decreasing, we think it is very important if we are going to deal with the other problems that are enunciated to have more African-American and Latinos and other minority teachers, so we must consider this goal also.

We would like to see by the year 2000 achievement of a 90-percent grade level reading rate for all ninth graders, and have a national test to determine what is the best reading level for ninth graders right across the country.

In the next 10 years following the year 2000, between 1999 and 2009, we set another set of goals. Increase by 50 percent the number of students who are entering into and graduating from college. We need to have more people who have college educations, who are able to take on the difficulties of our complex society and deal with the kinds of jobs that will be available in the year 2000 and beyond.

We also call for the improvement of the ratings of the performance of American students in international math and science comparisons. Here the President has gotten ahead of us. The President in his State of the Union Message called for making America No. 1 in math and science by the year 2000. I applaud the President. I join him in waving the flag. Here is one place where all Americans can get on board and say together we are going to try to achieve that goal. It would have a great impact and greatly improve our society if we could go with the President and by the year 2000 try to be No. 1 in math and science throughout the world.

Now, what does that mean? That means that there has to be a commitment immediately by the President to the training of more math and science teachers. In order to do that you are going to have to offer scholarships and fellowships, and approach our universities and our colleges and deal with the fact that there are so few people who are now involved in the teaching of math and science. You cannot achieve the goal without more teachers immediately.

But we applaud that, and I would like to join the President and say that is a very good fighting call, and all Americans should get behind us in trying to become No. 1 in math and science by the year 2000.

That does not mean that I do not think we should be No. 1 in language competence, in foreign languages, or No. 1 in terms of creative products like poetry and drama and plays. Czechoslovakia now has a playwright as President, and that is a great goal for

us one day to shoot for, to have a playwright or a novelist. I do not think those particular pursuits will be neglected because we are focusing on the math and science. I think some resources may be freed up if the Federal Government got more involved in math and science education and produced more of the resources for the math and science program. Localities and States would then have more money for some of these other things in these other areas, although sooner or later we need to have an across-the-board commitment by the Federal Government to help educate people in every area.

Another goal that we had was that we wanted to ensure 100 percent computer literacy for all high school graduates by the year 2009. We wanted to introduce individualized educational programs in all elementary and secondary schools, and achieve a 90-percent national adult literacy rate by the year 2000. Again, the President has said that he wants to have a 100-percent literacy rate, and I applaud the President on that goal, and I think we ought to go forward to do whatever is necessary to reach that goal. We agree with him and I am glad he went beyond us.

The key question that should be asked in the case of these goals and in the case of the goals that have been set by the Governors' Council is what activities will we undertake to facilitate the achievement of these goals. The President this year in H.R. 1675 should be asking and answering that question in terms of phase I. We should approach the redevelopment and revamping of our educational system in America the same way we approach the establishment of a first-rate defense system, or the same way we approach the problem of putting a man on the moon. It takes a massive effort, guided and coordinated by the Federal Government in this case, and most of the money and resources come from the State and local levels, but more money and resources and guidance should come from the Federal Government.

At present our Government is undertaking these responsibilities for only 6 percent of the total expenditures for education. In other words, we estimate that last year about \$360 billion totally in this country was spent on education, higher education, kindergarten, all of it, everything related to education, and of that \$360 billion only 6 percent was financed and paid for, funded by the Federal Government.

Six percent is where we were last year. At the beginning of the Reagan administration we were paying about 8 percent of the total education budget. We have gone down at a time when education has obviously become critical to all of us, and we obviously see that our system is in trouble. So we

should move from 6 percent toward 25 percent by the year 2000. That 25 percent is still only a small part of the total expenditure. We should move from 6 percent to 25 percent in terms of funding for education-related matters, and we should also move in terms of decisionmaking.

I do not want central control or Federal control of education, but if the Federal Government is involved in helping to make decisions, and guiding the process, and setting standards, just 25 percent of the total decisionmaking is Federal decisionmaking, that does not ruin the local and State control. Local and State entities would still have 75 percent of the control.

So we should talk about those kinds of goals and where we should move in that direction.

In order to achieve most of these goals we need a firmly established, well-working research and development system. Just as the Defense Department spends a large part of its budget on research and development and would not be a first rate defense apparatus if it did not spend a great deal of money on research and development, we have to spend a great deal of our budget on research and development. Any large corporation or enterprise, Xerox, IBM, they all spend a minimum of 1 percent of their total budget on research and development, and our Federal Government is spending only about \$100 million on research and development, whereas 1 percent of the total budget, \$360 billion, would be close to \$3 billion. Maybe the Federal Government should not undertake spending all of the money. Private enterprise could do some educational research and development as well, and the military should make a contribution since it is doing research and development. The products that it produces should be transferred to the civilian sector so that we can have the benefits of the military research and development on education. They do research and development on education also. But we are far from the goal of 1 percent.

The Governors' goals have all been stated in very general terms. All children in America will start school ready to learn. That is one of the Governor's goals. The Governors have said, as part of the explanation of these goals, that parents will have access to the training and support they need in order to prepare children to start school ready to learn.

That is a tall order.

□ 1820

We would like to see how that is going to be accomplished. We would like H.R. 1675 to tell us what the first step is in carrying out that goal, having parents have access to training and support. What is the first step, Mr. President?

They also said all children should go to school, they should receive good nutrition and their health care needs would be met through an enhanced health care system.

What is your first step, Mr. President, in moving on that goal?

Women, infants and children's program is serving only half of the eligible women, infants and children; only half are getting any help through our present program.

Are you saying that you are going to provide another \$2 billion so that all women who are eligible for the women, infants and children's program will receive services in order to reach this educational goal? I hope that is what you are saying. But I think it ought to be stated in H.R. 1675. What is the first step toward the achievement of that goal?

As I have said before, they have stated high school graduations will increase by 90 percent. What are you going to do in order to do that? The biggest problem is with the minority youngsters, African Americans, Latinos; how are we going to take steps to intervene into the culture, into the neighborhood, and come to grips with the other problems they are facing which prevent children from learning in school? What is your first step, Mr. President? Tell us in H.R. 1675.

They said U.S. students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including English, mathematics, science, history, and every school would insure that all students are prepared for citizenship and further learning in productive employment.

How will you take the first step to guarantee that, Mr. President?

Every adult American would be literate? What is your first step? In H.R. 1675 we would like more dialog.

We turned down the bill today—we did not turn it down, we postponed action on the bill today because the process is backwards. You are being presented with a fait accompli without much discussion. We are being presented with a bill written a year ago before the Governors had proposed their goals. We are given a bill which does not consider goals that have been offered by many other bodies, including a subcommittee of the Congress which is very much concerned and who have spent a great deal of time on this issue.

We would like to have the processes of the House to get back to a greater degree of professionalism, we would like to have the time-honored process to produce good legislation, that that be allowed to take place. Let us have maximum debate discussion, let us have a minimum of deals made at the White House.



Let us go forward and be serious about issues that have a great impact on the majority of the American people. Let us be serious about passing the Americans with Disabilities Act. Let us do that and do it rapidly.

Let us be serious about a first-rate credible child care bill which really does something for children and not allows us to go back home and just say that we have passed a bill.

There are some people who are willing to pass anything so long as they can say, "We took care of child health care." That is a betrayal of the children of America.

Finally, on education, which is on everybody's mind, the President wants to be the education President. We stated we wanted to be the education Congress.

Let us make sure that our first steps, our first initiatives are linked up with other things that are going to be done. Let us have a clear master plan as to where each step that we take each year will lead us by the year 2000.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORD of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for March 6 and March 7, on account of personal business matters.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DANNEMEYER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes each day, on March 8, March 13, March 14, and March 15.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes, on March 8.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS of Utah, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. OLIN, for 60 minutes, on April 4.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. OBEY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes each, on March 12 and 15.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. OWENS of New York) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OWENS of Utah, for 60 minutes, on March 8.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LENT.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

Mr. BEREUTER in three instances.

Mr. SKEEN.

Mr. GREEN in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. ROBERTS.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. DORNAN of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. MRAZEK.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. PEASE.

Mr. WISE.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. WEISS.

#### SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1430. An act to enhance national and community service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 2151. An act to permit the transfer of the obsolete submarine U.S.S. *Requin* to the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, before the expiration of the 60-day waiting period that would otherwise be applicable to the transfer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S.J. Res. 257. Joint resolution to designate March 10, 1990, as "Harriet Tubman Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2749. An act to authorize the conveyance of a parcel of land in Whitney Lake, TX, and

H.R. 4010. An act to provide the Secretary of Agriculture authority regarding the sale of sterile screwworms.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS of New York. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, 1990, at 11 a.m.

#### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the fourth quarter of 1989, as well as reports of the delegations to the North Atlantic Assembly, in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

##### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1989

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Mr. Bert R. Pena	11/4	11/9	Hong Kong	8,200.50	1,050.00						1,050.00
	11/9	11/10	Japan		195.00						195.00
Commercial transportation							2,673.00				2,673.00
Mr. John Hogan	11/14	11/12	Hong Kong	8,200.50	1,050.00						1,050.00
Commercial transportation							2,339.00				2,339.00
Other expenditures:											
Embassy personnel						455.92	58.35				58.35
Representation								77.50			77.50

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1989—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Committee total					2,295.00		5,070.35		77.50		7,442.85

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

E de la GARZA, Chairman, Feb. 12, 1990.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1989

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. John Murtha	10/7	10/9	Panama		66.67		1,535.00				1,601.67
Hon. John Murtha	12/15	12/16	United States		75.00						75.00
	12/16	12/16	El Salvador		89.00		1,535.00				1,624.00
Hon. John Murtha	12/28	12/29	Panama				1,535.00				1,535.00
Hon. John Porter	11/30	12/3	Taiwan		777.00						777.00
	12/3	12/6	Hong Kong		630.00						630.00
Commercial transportation							4,593.00				4,593.00
Hon. Carl Pursell	11/25	12/3	Japan		1,800.00						1,800.00
Commercial transportation							2,715.00				2,715.00
Delacroix Davis	12/6	12/9	United States		500.00						500.00
	12/9	12/14	New Zealand		636.00						636.00
	12/14	12/17	Antarctica								
	12/18	12/18	New Zealand		159.00						159.00
	12/19	12/21	United States		255.00						255.00
Commercial transportation							5,388.31				5,388.31
Robert V. Davis	12/4	12/5	Panama		360.00						360.00
	12/5	12/7	Colombia		290.00						290.00
Military transportation											
Richard E. Efford	11/27	11/27	Netherlands		164.00						164.00
	11/28	12/4	France		1,288.00		118.00				1,406.00
	12/5	12/5	Italy		179.00						179.00
	12/6	12/12	England		1,373.00		76.80				1,449.80
Commercial transportation							2,135.40				2,135.40
Henry E. Moore	11/27	12/8	Germany		836.00		45.00				881.00
Commercial transportation							4,379.00				4,379.00
Terry R. Peel	12/10	12/12	U.S.S.R.		544.00				18.00		562.00
	12/12	12/13	Italy		208.00						208.00
	12/13	12/18	Israel		830.00				12.00		842.00
	12/18	12/19	United Kingdom		217.00				108.00		325.00
Commercial transportation							5,559.00				5,559.00
John G. Plashal	10/7	10/8	Panama		66.67		1,535.00				1,601.67
John G. Plashal	12/15	12/16	United States		75.00						75.00
	12/16	12/16	El Salvador		89.00		1,535.00				1,624.00
John G. Plashal	12/28	12/29	Panama				1,535.00				1,535.00
Donald E. Richbourg	10/7	10/8	Panama		66.67		1,535.00				1,601.67
Donald E. Richbourg	12/28	12/29	Panama				1,535.00				1,535.00
Paul E. Thomson	12/4	12/9	United States		571.50		144.86				716.36
	12/10	12/14	New Zealand		636.00		344.00				980.00
	12/14	12/18	Antarctica								
	12/18	12/18	New Zealand		159.00						159.00
	12/19	12/21	United States		255.00						255.00
Commercial transportation							3,516.73				3,516.73
Committee total					13,195.51		41,295.10		138.00		54,628.61
Appropriations, surveys and investigations staff:											
Fred Brugger	12/4	12/7	Colombia		307.00		1,589.59		63.00		1,959.59
Carroll L. Hauver	10/25	10/28	Argentina		371.00		3,553.00		273.94		4,197.94
	10/29	11/1	Peru		343.00						343.00
	11/1	11/3	Mexico		229.50						229.50
	12/3	12/5	Panama		190.00				38.40		228.40
	12/5	12/7	Colombia		221.00						221.00
William P. Haynes	10/23	10/25	Ecuador		231.25		3,411.00		59.48		3,701.73
	10/26	11/1	Brazil		656.50						656.50
	11/1	11/4	Bolivia		231.00						231.00
Henry P. McDonald	10/25	10/29	Argentina		371.00		3,553.00		277.24		4,201.24
	10/29	11/1	Peru		343.00						343.00
	11/1	11/3	Mexico		229.50						229.50
	12/3	12/5	Panama		190.00				25.92		215.92
	12/5	12/7	Colombia		221.00						221.00
Robert H. Pearre	10/23	10/25	Ecuador		231.25		3,411.00		56.12		3,698.37
	10/26	11/1	Brazil		656.50						656.50
	11/1	11/4	Bolivia		231.00						231.00
Robert J. Reitwiesner	10/23	10/26	Ecuador		231.25				51.27		282.52
	10/26	11/1	Brazil		580.75						580.75
R.W. Vandergrift	10/25	10/29	Argentina		396.00		3,659.00		372.10		4,427.10
	10/29	11/1	Peru		343.00						343.00
	11/1	11/2	Mexico		153.00						153.00
	12/3	12/5	Panama		190.00				26.20		216.20
	12/5	12/7	Colombia		221.00						221.00
Committee total					7,368.50		19,176.59		243.67		27,788.76

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Chairman, Feb. 5, 1990.



## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1989

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Representative A. Hawkins.....	12/14	12/17	Japan.....		931.00		4,350.13				5,881.13
	12/18	12/21	Korea.....		600.00						
Representative C. Hayes.....	12/14	12/17	Japan.....		931.00		4,350.13				5,881.13
	12/18	12/21	Korea.....		600.00						
Carole Stringer.....	12/14	12/17	Japan.....		931.00		4,350.13				5,881.13
	12/18	12/21	Korea.....		600.00						
Andrew Hartman.....	12/14	12/17	Japan.....		931.00		4,350.13				5,881.13
	12/18	12/21	Korea.....		600.00						
Barbara Dandridge.....	12/14	12/17	Japan.....		931.00		4,102.23				5,633.23
	12/18	12/21	Korea.....		600.00						
Committee total.....					7,655.00		21,502.75				29,157.75

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GUS HAWKINS, Chairman, Feb. 6, 1990.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1989

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Michael Barrett.....	10/12	10/16	Belgium.....		732.00						732.00
	10/16	10/18	Hungary.....		348.00						348.00
	10/18	10/19	Czechoslovakia.....		196.00						196.00
	10/19	10/25	Italy.....		1,489.00						1,489.00
	10/26	10/30	Thailand.....		668.00						668.00
Commercial airfare.....							5,399.00				5,399.00
David Nelson.....	10/12	10/16	Belgium.....		732.00						732.00
	10/16	10/18	Hungary.....		348.00						348.00
	10/18	10/19	Czechoslovakia.....		196.00						196.00
	10/19	10/25	Italy.....		1,489.00						1,489.00
	10/26	10/30	Thailand.....		668.00						668.00
Commercial airfare.....							5,399.00				5,399.00
Stephen Sims.....	10/12	10/16	Belgium.....		732.00						732.00
	10/16	10/18	Hungary.....		348.00						348.00
	10/18	10/19	Czechoslovakia.....		196.00						196.00
	10/19	10/25	Italy.....		1,489.00						1,489.00
	10/26	10/30	Thailand.....		668.00						668.00
Commercial airfare.....							5,399.00				5,399.00
John Shelk.....	10/12	10/16	Belgium.....		732.00						732.00
	10/16	10/18	Hungary.....		348.00						348.00
	10/18	10/19	Czechoslovakia.....		196.00						196.00
	10/19	10/25	Italy.....		1,489.00						1,489.00
	10/26	10/30	Thailand.....		668.00						668.00
Commercial airfare.....							5,399.00				5,399.00
Peter Stockton.....	10/31	11/02	Hong Kong.....		630.00						630.00
Commercial airfare.....							1,851.00				1,851.00
Bruce Chafin.....	10/31	11/02	Hong Kong.....		630.00						630.00
Commercial airfare.....							1,851.00				1,851.00
John Haniel.....	10/31	11/02	Hong Kong.....		630.00						630.00
Commercial airfare.....							1,851.00				1,851.00
David Finnegan.....	11/15	11/18	Switzerland.....		398.00						398.00
Commercial airfare.....							2,417.00				2,417.00
Teresa Gorman.....	11/15	11/18	Switzerland.....		398.00						398.00
Commercial airfare.....							2,417.00				2,417.00
Tim Westmoreland.....	11/10	11/16	Italy.....		416.00						416.00
Commercial airfare.....							981.00				981.00
Joe Barton MC <sup>3</sup> .....	11/12	11/14	Switzerland.....								
Commercial airfare.....							1,337.00				1,337.00
Code Expenses.....											
Yugoslavia.....									12,294.84		12,294.84
Venice.....									1,189.49		1,189.49
Committee total.....					16,834.00		34,301.00		13,484.33		64,619.33

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Per diem will be filed on supplemental report.

JOHN D. DINGELL, Chairman.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1989

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Warner Session.....	11/7	11/8	France.....	1,266.54	202.00					1,266.54	202.00
	11/8	11/14	West Germany.....	1,503.89	816.00		860.79				1,676.79
Kenneth Salaets.....	11/7	11/8	France.....	1,266.54	202.00					1,266.54	202.00
	11/8	11/14	West Germany.....	1,503.89	816.00		860.79				1,676.79
Hon. Steven Schiff.....	11/9	11/10	Panama.....		206.00		5,963.48				6,169.48
	11/10	11/12	Nicaragua.....								
Peter Barash.....	12/13	12/17	France.....	4,999.28	836.00		2,667.27				3,503.27
	12/17	12/19	Belgium.....	14,880	400.00		259.84				659.84

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1989—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Theodore Jacobs	12/19	12/22	Spain		113,730		1,020.00			113,730	1,020.00
	12/13	12/17	France		4,999.28		836.00		2,667.27		3,503.27
	12/17	12/19	Belgium		14,880		400.00		259.84		659.84
Peter Vroom	12/19	12/22	Spain		113,730		1,020.00			113,730	1,020.00
	12/13	12/17	France		4,999.28		836.00		2,667.27		3,503.27
	12/17	12/19	Belgium		14,880		400.00		259.84		659.84
Donald Upson	12/19	12/22	Spain		113,730		1,020.00			113,730	1,020.00
	12/13	12/17	France		4,999.28		836.00				3,503.27
	12/17	12/19	Belgium		14,880		400.00		259.84		659.84
Committee total					10,246.00		19,393.50				29,639.50

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military aircraft per person.

JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Chairman, Jan. 31, 1990.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1989

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Chuck Douglas	12/1	12/2	Panama		66.00						66.00
	12/2	12/3	Honduras		70.00						70.00
Military transportation							1,667.33				1,667.33
Nora Engel	12/9	12/17	Italy		1,664.00				775.00		1,664.00
Commercial transportation									775.00		775.00
Mary McGillis	12/11	12/17	Italy		1,248.00				775.00		1,248.00
Commercial transportation									775.00		775.00
Cordia Strom	12/11	12/17	Italy		1,248.00				767.00		1,248.00
Commercial transportation									767.00		767.00
Hayden Gregory	12/13	12/15	Colombia		198.00				56.80		254.80
Military transportation							1,789.29				1,789.29
Hon. Don Edwards	12/16	12/19	Czechoslovakia		588.00						588.00
	12/19	12/22	Hungary		522.00						522.00
	12/22	12/23	Austria								
Commercial transportation							2,722.82				2,722.82
Committee total					5,604.00		8,496.44		56.80		14,157.24

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACK BROOKS, Chairman.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1989

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	10/27	10/28	Panama		306.00						306.00
	10/28	10/29	Nicaragua								
	10/29	10/30	El Salvador		127.00		2,759.13				2,886.13
Committee total					433.00		2,759.13				3,192.13

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military transport.

GLENN M. ANDERSON, Chairman, Jan. 31, 1990.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY DELEGATION TO THE NETHERLANDS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 14 AND APR. 17, 1989

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Jack Brooks	4/14/89	4/17/89	Netherlands		492.00						
Military transportation							5,587.40				6,079.40
Hon. Charles Rose	4/14/89	4/17/89	Netherlands		492.00						
Military transportation							5,587.40				6,079.40
Peter Abbruzzese	4/14/89	4/17/89	Netherlands		492.00						
Military transportation							5,587.40				6,079.40
Arch W. Roberts	4/14/89	4/17/89	Netherlands		494.00						
Military transportation							5,587.40				6,079.40



REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY DELEGATION TO THE NETHERLANDS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN  
APR. 14 AND APR. 17, 1989—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Committee total					1,968.00		22,349.60				24,317.60

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACK BROOKS, June 27, 1989.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY DELEGATION TO ROME, ITALY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 5  
AND OCT. 10, 1989

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Dante B. Fascell	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Charles Rose	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Jack Brooks	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Ron Dellums	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Larry Smith	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Cardiss Collins	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Sam Gibbons	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Gerald Solomon	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. J. Alex McMillan	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Doug Bereuter	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Tom Bliley	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Jan Meyers	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. Marge Roukema	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Hon. John J. Brady	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Peter Abburzese	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Nancy Shuba Mims	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Dara Schieker	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Sharon Matts	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Ronald Lasch	10/6	10/10	Italy		1,015.00		4,873.22				5,888.22
Military transportation											
Josephine Weber	10/5	10/10	Italy		1,015.00						
Commercial transportation							1,378.00				
Military transportation							2,436.61				4,829.61
Arch W. Roberts	10/7	10/10	Italy		812.00						
Military transportation							2,436.61				3,248.61
Robert M. Jenkins	10/6	10/9	Italy		1,015.00						
Commercial transportation							1,361.89				
Military transportation							2,436.61				4,813.50
Stephen E. Biegun	10/6	10/9	Italy		812.00						
Commercial transportation							1,378.00				
Military transportation							2,436.61				4,626.61
Committee total					23,954.00		111,328.73				135,282.73

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANTE B. FASCELL, Chairman.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the speaker's table and referred as follows:

2656. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Navy's pro-

posed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Japan for defense articles (transmittal No. 90-26), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 118; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2657. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the 1990 joint military

net assessment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113(j); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2658. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter(s) of offer and acceptance [LOA] to Japan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 90-26), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, March 7, 1990.

2659. A letter from the Acting Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2660. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2661. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2662. A letter from the Archivist, National Archives, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2663. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2664. A letter from the Executive Director, National Mediation Board, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2665. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1989, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2666. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2667. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2668. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2669. A letter from the Marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the cost of the protective function provided by the Supreme Court Police, to Justices, official guests, and employees of the Court, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 13n(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary, March 7, 1990.

2670. A letter from the Chairman, Cultural Property Advisory Committee, transmit-

ting a report of its findings and recommendations to the November 1989 request of the Government of Guatemala for emergency United States import restrictions of archaeological material from the Peten region, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2605(f)(6); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 3581. A bill entitled the "Rural Economic Development Act of 1989"; with amendments (Rept. 101-415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. TAUZIN):

H.R. 4205. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for the Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ECKART, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MANTON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 4206. A bill to express the sense of the Congress regarding a national agenda for extending and improving language instruction in the elementary schools of the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLEMAN of Texas:

H.R. 4207. A bill to provide for a program to monitor and improve air quality in regions along the border between the United States and the United States of Mexico; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CROCKETT (for himself, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FISH, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 4208. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow judges who are at least 62 years of age to retire if they have served for at least 25 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 4209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an additional tax on income derived from publishing newspapers which do not use recycled newsprint; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. ECKART):

H.R. 4210. A bill to amend the Antarctic Conservation Act of 1978 to protect the environment of Antarctica, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; Science, Space, and Technology; Energy and Commerce; and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 4211. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 with respect to administrative proceedings applicable to claims of discrimination in Federal employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAYES of Louisiana:

H.R. 4212. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for expenditures for conservation measures to protect wetlands of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEHMAN of California (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 4213. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to protect consumers from the use of inaccurate credit information and the misuse of credit information, to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to prevent consumer abuse by credit repair organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. NOWAK (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MOODY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DEWINE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ECKART):

H.R. 4214. A bill to prevent and control infestations of the coastal and inland waters of the United States by the zebra mussel, and other nonindigenous aquatic nuisance species; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. PATTERSON:

H.R. 4215. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on P-Tolualdehyde (p-Tal); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSO (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.R. 4216. A bill to require the Export-Import Bank of the United States to supplement the financing of United States exports to Eastern European countries with emerging market economies until the developed countries agree to eliminate the use of tied aid and partially untied aid credits for commercial purposes with respect to such Eastern European countries; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 4217. A bill to authorize the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to purchase approximately 8 acres of land at the Fort Sumner Municipal Airport, De



Baca County, NM; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 4218. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an environmental reserve program for erodible cropland, pastureland, and converted wetlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SYNAR (for himself, Mr. PARNETTA, and Mr. Glickman):

H.R. 4219. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to reform the provisions of such act governing exported pesticides, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming:

H.R. 4220. A bill to repeal the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act of 1986 and amendments made by such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WISE (for himself and Mr. McCANDLESS):

H.R. 4221. A bill to require the Director of National Drug Control Policy to establish procedures to allow State and local governments to buy weapons and other equipment in conjunction with the Federal Government for purposes of drug enforcement; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWYER of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. UNSOELD):

H.J. Res. 507. Joint resolution designating August 20 through 26, 1990, as "National Headache and Jaw Joint Disorders Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SKEEN (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. RHODES, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BUNNING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WEBER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SHARP, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. DENNY SMITH):

H.J. Res. 508. Joint resolution designating May 1990 as "Take Pride in America Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 283. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the amounts for national defense included in the budget of the United States Government for fiscal year 1991 should be reduced by 10 percent and the funds from the reduction should be allocated to reduce the deficit and to support certain other programs; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 352. Resolution designating membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 353. Resolution establishing the order of Republican membership on the

Public Works and Transportation Committee; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GRAY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. GEJDENSEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. FAUNTROY):

H. Res. 354. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding United States military assistance for the Republic of Liberia and human rights abuses in Liberia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

322. The Speaker presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the increase of Federal income tax exemption for dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 70: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 101: Mr. MOODY.  
H.R. 283: Mr. GEREN and Mr. PURSELL.  
H.R. 446: Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
H.R. 467: Mr. FUSTER and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.  
H.R. 857: Mr. ATKINS and Mr. YATES.  
H.R. 860: Mr. OWENS of Utah and Mr. RITTER.  
H.R. 884: Ms. OAKAR.  
H.R. 1069: Mr. FISH.  
H.R. 1136: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
H.R. 1142: Mr. CARPER and Mr. SAXTON.  
H.R. 1287: Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. MARLENEE.  
H.R. 1383: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. PERKINS.  
H.R. 1457: Mr. NIELSON of Utah and Mr. MOODY.  
H.R. 1463: Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MILLER of California.  
H.R. 1476: Mr. WALGREEN.  
H.R. 2351: Mr. HATCHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. YATES, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. HOLLOWAY, and Mrs. LLOYD.  
H.R. 2460: Mr. SHAW, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. MORRISON of Washington.  
H.R. 2546: Mr. McDermott, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. CHANDLER.  
H.R. 2584: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. CONdit, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GEJDENSEN, and Mr. DEWINE.  
H.R. 2881: Mr. BATEMAN.  
H.R. 3123: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, and Ms. LONG.  
H.R. 3267: Mr. DONNELLY and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 3346: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 3464: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 3471: Mr. WALGREEN.

H.R. 3500: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 3509: Mr. CALLAHAN and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 3581: Mr. McEWEN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 3595: Mr. LENT, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 3604: Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 3615: Mr. ROE, Mr. WISE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 3643: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 3664: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 3693: Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FISH, and Mr. COURTER.

H.R. 3701: Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WALGREEN, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SABO, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. JAMES, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. YATES, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 3732: Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. HATCHER.

H.R. 3740: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 3798: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 3806: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. CONdit.

H.R. 3850: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 3859: Mr. WILSON and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 3866: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 3899: Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ROSE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 3907: Mr. BUECHNER.

H.R. 3929: Mr. GEJDENSEN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LONG, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 3937: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BATES, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 3948: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BATES, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. STARK, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 3988: Mr. FASCELL and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3994: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 4025: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 4026: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 4053: Mr. UDALL and Mr. McCLOSKEY.

H.R. 4060: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 4064: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 4109: Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4138: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. GEKAS.

H.J. Res. 248: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota and Mr. FUSTER.

H.J. Res. 364: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GEREN, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.J. Res. 451: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. GEREN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. FROST, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.J. Res. 452: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. BRUCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.J. Res. 469: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.J. Res. 473: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. CARR, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HOYER, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.J. Res. 475: Mr. DIXON, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. PRICE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RITTER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. SABO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BOSCO, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.J. Res. 479: Mr. BROWDER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WYLIE,

Mr. HOYER, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SISISKY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. HENRY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LENT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SEXTON, and Mr. ROSE.

H.J. Res. 480: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. OAKAR, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H. Con. Res. 130: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. GRANDY.

H. Con. Res. 232: Mr. GOSS.

H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DYSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. KOLTER.

H. Con. Res. 268: Mrs. KENNELLY and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 269: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BATES, Mr. MOODY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 270: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr.

JONTZ, Mr. MINETA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PALONE, Mr. YATES, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FROST, and Mr. SKELTON.

H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. NATCHER.

H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HERTEL, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. FRANK, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. OLIN.

H. Res. 312: Mr. PORTER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PEASE, Mr. TORRES, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SCHNEIDER, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

### H.R. 3581

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

—Page 52, after line 10, insert the following:  
SEC. 604. RURAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH ASSISTANCE.

Section 502 of the Rural Development Act of 1972 (7 U.S.C. 2662) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) RESEARCH GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the programs already conducted under this section, the Secretary shall also establish and carry out a program to award competitive research grants to land-grant colleges and universities, research foundations, and centers established by land-grant universities, State agricultural experiment stations, and to all colleges and universities having demonstrable capability in rural development research, as determined by the Secretary, to carry out research to evaluate the impact of Federal and State economic development policies and programs designed to improve economic competitiveness and diversification, support strategic planning for economic investments, improve human resources, and improve the data base for rural development decisionmaking in rural areas.

“(2) LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not to exceed \$3,000,000 in each fiscal year. Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.”

Redesignate succeeding sections accordingly.